

DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
Cl. No. 05v:M8 D9
Date of release for loan
Ac. No. 112454 23 OCT 1958
This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of one anna will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

Periods of European Literature

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR SAINTSBURY

XI.

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH

PERIODS OF EUROPEAN LITERATURE.

EDITED BY PROFESSOR SAINTSBURY.

A COMPLETE AND CONTINUOUS HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT

In 12 Crown 8vo Volumes. Price 5s net each.

"The criticism which alone can much help us for the future is a criticism which regards Europe as being, for intellectual and spiritual purposes, one great confederation, bound to a joint action and working to a common result"

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

I.	The DARK AGES	Professor W P KER.
II.	The FLOURISHING OF ROMANCE AND THE RISE OF ALLEGORY	THE EDITOR
III	The FOURTEENTH CENTURY	F J SNELL
IV	The TRANSITION PERIOD	G GREGORY SMITH
V	The EARLIER RENAISSANCE	THE EDITOR
VI	The LATER RENAISSANCE	DAVID HANNAY
VII	The FIRST HALF OF 17TH CENTURY	Professor H. J C GRIERSON.
VIII	The AUGUSTAN AGES	Professor O ELTON.
IX	The MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	J H. MILLAR
X	The ROMANTIC REVOLT	Professor C E VAUGHAN
XI.	The ROMANTIC TRIUMPH	T S OMOND
XII	The LATER NINETEENTH CENTURY	THE EDITOR

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH

BY

T. S. OMOND, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

SECOND IMPRESSION

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MCMIX

All Rights reserved

PREFACE.

THE scope of this volume differs somewhat from that of its predecessors in the same series. They dealt with remoter times and less familiar authors, so were bound to give much detailed information. In this volume, concerned mainly with writers whose names are household words, it has been thought sufficient to give only such particulars as were required to bring out the general effect. Neither biography nor bibliography has been made prominent. The wish was to paint a general picture, preferring broad outlines to finished studies, to depict a movement by showing it embodied in its representatives. Not individual writers, but the Romantic Triumph, forms our subject, parts are of value only as constituting a whole. Thus the student may be led to form conceptions for himself, rather than take them ready-made from the lips of any historian.

Such a scheme does not encourage novelty of treatment, or postulate direct acquaintance with every book mentioned The limits of the writer's knowledge will appear in the course of his survey. Their straitness need not prevent fidelity in the broad lines of portraiture adopted. For the aim throughout has been to give literary facts, not literary opinions, and the "personal equation" has been studiously subordinated That it may still colour some statements, is doubtless only too possible, but at least the effort has been made to avoid partisanship.

The book was planned on rather too liberal a scale, and has been shortened by omission or condensation of minor authors. Dates and facts have been checked by reference to our own Encyclopædias and Biographical Dictionaries, the German Conversations-Lexicons, the *Nouvelle biographie générale* and *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, the dictionaries of Allibone, Vapereau, and many others Sources of special information are too numerous to recount, a few will be found cited in the bibliographical notes Ideas as well as facts may often have been taken from these. In treating authors familiar from childhood, it is seldom possible to tell what is altogether one's own, what suggested by others. Even were the distinction feasible, it would be out of place in this volume, where accuracy, not originality, has been the object sought

Beginning midway through a great Movement, it

has not been thought necessary to define that movement. This falls to be done by other writers of the series The English reader may meantime be referred to a book whose acquaintance I regret to have made only while these sheets were passing through the press The introduction to Professor Herford's *Age of Wordsworth* discusses with searching insight the nature of Romanticism, while his treatise itself, though covering part only of the ground occupied in this volume, takes possession of all it covers with scholarly fulness of knowledge.

Among many general obligations one particular debt must be specified, though to enlarge on it is forbidden. My editor's suggestion — or friendly compulsion — originated this volume, and his advice has done more for it than can be readily expressed. But he is not responsible for shortcomings of execution. His help may be traced in whatever it has of value, its faults are the writer's own.

EDINBURGH, *December* 1899.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY.

PAGE

Romantic impulse—Its genesis—Importance in English literature —Date of its triumph—Where first observable . . 1

CHAPTER I.

BRITISH ROMANTIC POETS.

Scott: his method—His material—Character of his verse—Influence of his poems—Always a poet—His lyrics and ballads —Coleridge as poet—Southey—Wordsworth direction of Romantic Movement—Love of antiquity—Love of nature—With Wordsworth a religion—Its abiding influence—First stage of Movement—*Dii minores*—Hogg—Landor—Moore—Campbell—Leigh Hunt—Older survivors—Second stage of Movement—Byron his life—Quantity and quality of his work—Variety of matter—Principal faculty—Style and metre —His genius for comedy—His failure in tragedy—Criticism and summary—Shelley, his personal character—Perfection of his method—Matthew Arnold's criticism—Ideality and lyric gift—Charm of his personality—Keats, his short life—Character of his work—Immature yet important—Succession to Keats—Writers of transition period—Neo-Romantic revival—Elizabeth Barrett, her aims and method—Defects of her style

—Absence of simplicity—Alfred Tennyson his slow growth —Not merely an artist—But essentially artistic—His teaching and influence—Robert Browning his habits of thought—Neglect of early poems—The fault his own—The misfortune mutual—Conclusion 6

CHAPTER II.

FICTION AND LIGHT LITERATURE

Development of the novel—Scott's predecessors—His own method —Truth to life—Outside and inside—His personal history—His relation to Romance—His immense influence—Sister novelists—Miss Austen her attack on ultra-Romanticism—Miss Edgeworth—Miss Ferrier—Other contemporaries—Galt —Immediate followers—Influences other than fiction—Journals—The magazine proper—Its literary value—Charles Lamb —Southey—Cobbett—Hazlitt—De Quincey—John Wilson—John Gibson Lockhart—The Blackwood school—Varieties—Travel literature—The drama Tragedy—Comedy—Carlyle lateness of development—Novel resumed—Bulwer Lytton faults and merits—Thackeray his attitude to Romance—Charm of manner—Influence and teaching—Dickens his upbringing and popularity—Relation to Thackeray—Method and mannerisms—Disraeli his habit of thought—Other novelists —The Bronte family—Place of Charlotte Bronte—Romanticism and democracy—Popularising of knowledge—Ruskin—*Punch*—Miscellanea—Conclusion . 73

CHAPTER III.

DIDACTIC LITERATURE. HISTORY, SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY

Scope of this chapter—Historical writing—Some pioneers—Hallam —The next decade—Principal group—Arnold—Grote: *History of Greece*—Thirlwall—Other members of group—Macaulay, defects and merits—Later historians—Summary and conclusion—Writers on science—Buckland and Sedgwick—

Faraday — Herschel — Murchison — Lyell — Owen — Robert Chambers and Hugh Miller — De Morgan and Forbes — Darwin reflects spirit of age — Its result in thought — Philosophy proper — Bentham — James Mill — Austin — John Stuart Mill life and books — Character of his work — High place as a writer — Successors to Mill — Influence of school — Herbert Spencer — Mackintosh — Other independent thinkers — Coleridge as philosopher matter and manner — Effect of his teaching — Pupils of Coleridge — Scottish school — Hamilton style and method — Impression produced — Followers of Hamilton — Influence of this school — Semi philosophical writers — Importance of theology — Evangelical revival — Broad Church and High Church — Keble — Augustus Hare — Hampden — Julius Hare — Pusey — Newman his literary power — Minor authors — Bishop Wilberforce — Manning, and others — Effects on literature — Scottish divinity — Chalmers — His successors — Conclusion 131

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN FRANCE

Origin of Romantic Movement — Literature of the Restoration — Wide diffusion of movement — Lamartine's first volume — Chenier and Delavigne — Beranger — Translations — Prose writers Lamennais, Constant, Cousin — Professional reviewers — University leaders Villemain Guizot, Cousin — Disciples of Cousin — History Michaud, Barante, Sismondi, Thierry, Michelet, Thiers — Socialistic school — Natural science — Victor Hugo — *Hernani* — English actors in Paris — Revolution in verse — Freedom and sonority — Chief early writings — Character of his work — Other Romantics — Vigny — Poet and novelist — Sainte Beuve — Musset — Work and limitations — Gautier — Strength of his work — Beginnings of change — Lamartine — His real importance — Minor verse — Stendhal — Fiction Balzac — His life — His works — Their subject — His method — Aims and results — Dumas — Criticism of Dumas — His rightful place — George Sand — Characterisation of her work — Style and short comings — Merimee — Eugene Sue — Janin — Bernard — Karr — Summary transition to drama — Brief vogue of Romantic

drama—Inherent drawbacks—Rival dramatists—Comedy· Scribe—Other writers of comedy—Writers of criticism—Joubert, and others—Publicists—Proudhon—Louis Blanc—Lacordaire—Montalembert—The Guérins—Ozanam—Women-writers—Later historians—Tocqueville—Comte—His system—His great work—Its abiding value—Conclusion—Influence of French writers—Causes of gratitude—Passage to Germany . 192

CHAPTER V

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN GERMANY

Introductory—Men and dates—Goethe's old age—His kingly place—Romantic leaders—August Schlegel—Friedrich Schlegel—Their teaching—Religious prepossession—Popular approval—Tieck—Hoffmann—Fouqué—Younger writers—Kerner—Uhland—Zenith of Romanticism—Patriotic poetry—Drama—Austrian poets—Central group—Prose writing—Richter—The German novel—Some minor novelists—Critics—Journalists—Scholars—History Niebuhr—Niebuhr's method—And results—Successors to Niebuhr—Jurisconsults—Philosophy Schelling—His attitude—Hegel—Personality—Influence of school—Right and left wings—Science—Theology Schleiermacher—His teaching—His school—General results—Young Germany—Heine. his work—Effects of ill health—His method—Flouts and jeers—Faith in the ideal—Ever a fighter—Modern spirit—Unique result—Effect of his work—Fellow-writers—Freiligrath—Other singers—Later prose Auerbach and Freytag—Struwwelpeter—Critics—History and theology—Philosophy. Schopenhauer—Physical science—Conclusion . . . 280

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Italy, introductory—Era of revolution—Foscolo—Manzoni—*Promessi sposi*—Romanticism begun—School of Manzoni—Leopardi. his work—His influence—Reasons for decay of

poetry—Guerrazzi—Giusti—Other poets and critics—Philosophers—Historians—Summary and results—Spanish literature—Predecessors of Romanticism—Rosa—Rivas—Herreros and others—The climax Larra and Espronceda—Didactic writers—Greek literature—Switzerland—Dutch literature—Lennep—Younger writers—Flemish literature—Denmark—Oehlenschlager—Thorwaldsen and Andersen—Norway—Sweden. Ling and Tegnér—Almqvist—Runeberg and others—Finland—Russian literature—Kriloff and others—Pushkin—Gogol—Mickiewicz—Hungarian literature—Romantic poets—Romantic prose-writers—Bohemian literature—Its great revival—End of first stage . . . 345

CONCLUSION.

General Summary—Features of Movement—Forms of expression—New use of prose—Direction of working—Final effect . . 395

INDEX 401

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH.

INTRODUCTORY.

ROMANTIC IMPULSE—ITS GENESIS—IMPORTANCE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE —DATE OF ITS TRIUMPH—WHERE FIRST OBSERVABLE

THAT great literary upheaval which followed the political revolution of 1788 and succeeding years is known to us as the Romantic Revival. For, throughout Europe generally, it took the form of a revolt against methods and traditions which claimed authority as Classical, and in its love rather of colour than of form, and of impressiveness than of precision, it betrayed kinship to what critics are agreed to call Romance. This word, indeed, is associated with bygone more than with coming days, with chivalric pageant and ecclesiastic ceremonial, not with democratic violence or the passionless outlook of science. Yet the new spirit, fed by these latter, and taking for its province the Future not the Past of humanity, found none the

Romantic impulse

less its fullest utterance in men whose hearts and hopes had scant sympathy with its political aspiration. Lessing, and Scott, and Chateaubriand — showing the way to Byron, Shelley, and Victor Hugo—joined the storming party against the Classical fortress, and consciously or unconsciously lent weight to an irresistible onset The impetus which burst pedantic rules of a fossilised creed inspired at once fiery Radical and wistful Conservative, uniting both in the cause of liberty and renovation.

Other volumes of the present series must be left to trace this movement in its earlier stages. They will show how simultaneous was the uprising, how impossible to assign its origin to any nation of Europe exclusively. Rousseau may lead the assault in one part of the field, "Ossian" and the Scandinavian reaction herald it in another. Celtic mainly at one period, it took later a prevailing Teutonic tinge For the revival of German literature coincided with its outbreak, and drew force from its inspiration The great minds which led that revival were deeply imbued with Romanticism Their initiative and example diffused it far and wide. Every nation of Europe felt the result, ourselves among the foremost Burger's ballads fired Scott, equally with the legends of his own land; Taylor of Norwich introduced Southey and Coleridge to German literature. *L'Allemagne* spoke the key-word of imaginative revolt, here as across the Channel. What Madame de Stael's descriptions did for France, a score of translators and adapters did for England, nor must we

Its genesis

forget Wordsworth's stay for a winter at Goslar. The new learning was catholic in sympathy Italy and Spain, the Northern peninsula, Russia, Egypt, and the mystic East, all came under contribution, directly or indirectly yielding stores to the common stock But, in the dawning days of this Century, German influence was beyond all others potent with lovers of romance and diablerie, the beginnings of the Romantic impulse were everywhere quickened by enthusiastic study of German literature.

Importance in English literature

When we come to consider results rather than origins, however, no literary history is more instructive than our own In none is the transition more clearly marked, in none is the record writ more largely and completely. It is but natural, therefore, that in a book intended for English readers the first and most prominent place should be given to our own movement. Even on the most general grounds, and having regard to European rather than insular standards of criticism, this course seems plainly justified No Continental appraiser will minimise the importance of Scott and Byron, Wordsworth and Tennyson, Dickens and Carlyle. To our own literature, then, let attention first be turned. The problems which it suggests, the characterisations which it requires, will be found to have cleared the way for a better comprehension of the Romantic Movement as it influenced other nations of Europe.

During the first decade of the Nineteenth Century, the Romantic Revival made continuous progress in

this country. By the year 1810 it may fairly be said to have reached maturity. Scott had attained his poetical zenith, Wordsworth had produced nearly all his best work, Coleridge's *annus mirabilis* lay already far in the past To the general public, indeed, these writers were still strange, nay in some cases hardly known. But the student of literature must distinguish between the first impulse of creation in original minds, and its later acceptance by adopters and imitators In the England of 1810, few readers may have been conscious that the old régime was ended Leading writers still followed the old methods. Crabbe, Bowles, and Rogers in so-called poetry, Joanna Baillie and the younger Colman in drama; Bentham and Godwin, Dugald Stewart and Alison, Cobbett, Malthus, Mrs Radcliffe, and Isaac D'Israeli in various departments of prose—these were the chief stars in the literary firmament, uneclipsed yet by the splendour of a new dawn. For years still the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews would repeat ancient fallacies, and the universities refuse to believe that the night had really gone and passed. None the less the historian, looking back, realises that the Romantic Reaction was already victorious. At the blast of its defiance the walls of tradition had fallen in ruin The young, the eager, the generous—all the creative vigour, all the guiding impulses, of the new age—were heart and soul with it The rest could be but a question of time. It is our task here to note the results of victory, the spread and progress of this mighty revolution, to record the successive stages and

Date of its triumph

periods of what may be now called the Romantic Triumph.

In a literature like English, highly developed for centuries, the new spirit naturally showed itself first in imaginative writing. It is matter indeed of surprise that a language so old, and so well exploited already, as ours, should have been capable of such a new burst of development. All the auguries pointed the other way. A Byzantine age of dulness, or at best an Alexandrian age of criticism and culture, might have been reasonably expected. History furnishes no parallel to the astonishing re-birth of imaginative literature which ushered in the Nineteenth Century in this country. A wind which blew where it listed seemed to sweep over the dry bones of English letters, and awaken them in a veritable resurrection. Not in historical writing, not in criticism or philosophy, need we look for the beginning of the new era. Poets and imaginative writers generally were first to feel it, in their writings we shall best trace its earlier successes. From them it spread far and wide, overflowing all departments of literature. But the new birth of imagination, as was every way natural, made itself first felt in works of pure imagination; whatever may be the ultimate limits of our survey, it is to poetry above all else that it must direct its initial regard.

Where first observable

CHAPTER I.

BRITISH ROMANTIC POETS.

SCOTT HIS METHOD — HIS MATERIAL — CHARACTER OF HIS VERSE — INFLUENCE OF HIS POEMS — ALWAYS A POET — HIS LYRICS AND BALLADS — COLERIDGE AS POET — SOUTHEY — WORDSWORTH DIRECTION OF ROMANTIC MOVEMENT — LOVE OF ANTIQUITY — LOVE OF NATURE — WITH WORDSWORTH A RELIGION — ITS ABIDING INFLUENCE — FIRST STAGE OF MOVEMENT — *DII MINORES* — HOGG — LANDOR — MOORE — CAMPBELL — LEIGH HUNT — OLDER SURVIVORS — SECOND STAGE OF MOVEMENT — BYRON. HIS LIFE — QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF HIS WORK — VARIETY OF MATTER — PRINCIPAL FACULTY — STYLE AND METRE — HIS GENIUS FOR COMEDY — HIS FAILURE IN TRAGEDY — CRITICISM AND SUMMARY — SHELLEY. HIS PERSONAL CHARACTER — PERFECTION OF HIS METHOD — MATTHEW ARNOLD'S CRITICISM — IDEALITY AND LYRIC GIFT — CHARM OF HIS PERSONALITY — KEATS HIS SHORT LIFE — CHARACTER OF HIS WORK — IMMATURE YET IMPORTANT — SUCCESSION TO KEATS — WRITERS OF TRANSITION PERIOD — NEO-ROMANTIC REVIVAL — ELIZABETH BARRETT HER AIMS AND METHOD — DEFECTS OF HER STYLE — ABSENCE OF SIMPLICITY — ALFRED TENNYSON HIS SLOW GROWTH — NOT MERELY AN ARTIST — BUT ESSENTIALLY ARTISTIC — HIS TEACHING AND INFLUENCE — ROBERT BROWNING HIS HABITS OF THOUGHT — NEGLECT OF EARLY POEMS — THE FAULT HIS OWN — THE MISFORTUNE MUTUAL — CONCLUSION

THE first Romance poet to gain the ear of the public was Walter Scott (1770-1832)[1] In him the new era

[1] Editions of authors so well known need not be specified. Repre-

first spoke so as to command attention But we must not suppose that he was regarded as a purveyor of novelties. On the contrary, reviewers accounted him one trying back to archaic and obsolete models. It was too late in the day to resuscitate ballad-forms, said the great critic Jeffrey. So far could dress hide from keenest eyes the reality of new life Ballad-measure, in itself, was of course an ancient and effete form of verse. It had been revived by antiquarians in the previous half-century, and brought low by feeble imitations Johnson's sturdy ridicule was scarcely needed to kill it.

Scott.

"I put my hat upon my head,
And walked into the Strand,

sentative extracts from leading writers are given in Ward's *Eng Poets*, vol iv (Macmillan, 1880), and Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, book iv Miles, *The Poets and Poetry of the Century* (10 vols, London, 1898), supplements these for less known writers *English Men of Letters* (Macmillan) and *Great Writers* (Scott) contain several pertinent volumes Saintsbury's *Nineteenth Century Literature* (1896) and Herford's *The Age of Wordsworth* (1897) furnish critical summaries. The chief Memoirs — Lockhart's *Scott*, Moore's *Byron*, *Southey's Life and Correspondence*, &c —are mines of information Dykes Campbell's *Coleridge* (1894) should be added to these For Wordsworth, see a selection from the Wordsworth Society papers (*Wordsworthiana*, Macmillan, 1889), and the prefaces by Matthew Arnold and Mr John Morley to different editions of his poems Shelley literature is very extensive, Hogg and Trelawny's accounts deserve special study Two new editions of Byron are at this moment adding much to our knowledge of him. Tennyson's *Memoir* and the *Browning Letters* (3 vols) are important for facts, while of books on these writers, and on our period generally, there is indeed no end Those of Professor Dowden at home, MM Taine and Scherer abroad, may be specially mentioned; the more so as both Taine's *History* and Scherer's *Essays* are accessible in English translations

> And there I met another man,
> Whose hat was in his hand"—

was really no very exaggerated parody of the weaker style of ballad. No task could have seemed much more futile than to attempt reanimating this corpse Men of reading and culture were the last to believe it possible To the end, Jeffrey was but half converted, he did not realise the greatness of Scott's achievement. He pats and patronises his illustrious fellow-citizen, and gives somewhat grudging praise even to *Marmion* and the *Lady* Well might Scott's wife make mouths at him in her pretty French way, and "hope he was very well paid for his review" That the briefless advocate, the unscholarly antiquarian, the boon companion of many a festive evening, could transform the whole face of English poetry, and by so hopeless-seeming an expedient as renewing a mode of verse left to the bellman and the singer of executions, was more than any critic could be expected to believe, and it is not at all wonderful that Jeffrey never thoroughly accepted or understood it.

His method

How Scott went to work is well known. He did not try to tinker up the crude, hard-worn jingle of plain "eights and sixes" Taking a hint from Coleridge, which in the nature of things could have been only a hint, he invented the admirable adaptation which forms the metre of his chief poems It varies in detail from one to the other, but the essence is always the same. Instead of a succession of detached stanzas, he gives a long *para-*

graph of verse, the pauses and the accents and the rhymes of which can be varied very much as the writer pleases This elastic metre was admirably adapted to his free, spirited, unconventional narration. As a vehicle of narrative, indeed, it is unsurpassable in English. In this respect, though in no other, it may even be compared to the Greek hexameter Those who tried to render Homer or Virgil in this measure were misled by recognising this. But the metre is too well marked, too individual, to be a useful organ of translation, Conington's Æneid is but Virgil *Scottyfied* The perfecting of this vehicle—its creation so far as bold and strong effects are concerned—forms Scott's first claim to eminence. But it is very far from being his only one

His material

For years it has been the custom to depreciate Scott as a poet The very facility of his style brought out a host of imitators. Satiety ensued, and was followed by a natural reaction in favour of other forms of poetry. Thought, not mere picturesqueness, music, not mere animated jingle—these were proclaimed indispensable, and Scott suffered accordingly The true poet, we were told, must know men from within, not merely from without. He must deal with sin and suffering, must enter into the great heart of humanity, and sing the woes of the ages. And no doubt the greatest singers are both philosophers and artists, and the depths and heights of man's nature their familiar province Yet there are times, after all, when one wearies of psy-

chologic analysis, and longs for simpler, sunnier minstrelsy, or even is tempted to exclaim profanely with Browning—

> "Enter in the heart? Its shelly
> Cuirass guard mine, fore and aft!
> Such song enters in the belly,
> And is cast out in the draught."

Tired with the aimless melancholy and perpetual unrest of modern poetry, one goes back to Scott as to a breezy midsummer morning, welcome indeed after dreary night-watches or fevered tossing on however soft a pillow.

The natural appeal of Scott's poetry is to the young This he frankly recognised, and rather prided himself on, just as he liked to be thought the country gentleman wielding awhile the tool of the penman.

> "Flow forth, flow unrestrained, my tale!"

—and he takes full use of his licence, which might with advantage have been exercised more sparingly. But, when all offset is made, how delightful is the result! How brave, and free, and cheering the lilt of his verse! With what Homeric directness and simplicity he carries us along! This *Lady of the Lake*, for instance, at whose publication we take up his career, is surely a masterpiece in its way. The story is well compacted, lays hold on us at once, from the admirably told account of the chase at the beginning, to the dénouement in Stirling Castle. We know the tale by heart, but can read it with fresh interest.

The dialogue between Fitz-James and Roderick Dhu is still vivid as their fighting, the Fiery Cross still glows as it hurries through the glens If there is no battle-piece so fine as that in *Marmion*, there are dozens of passages as eager and brilliant.

> "With heart of fire, and foot of wind,
> The fierce avenger is behind
> Fate judges of the rapid strife ;—
> The forfeit death—the prize is life"

Scott's characters stand out clear and heroic, unlike Byron's shadowy Corsairs, or Wordsworth's ethereal-ised Cliffords and Nortons. And, speaking of battle-pieces, what can be more vigorous than the charge out of the Trosachs pass ?—

> "Bearing before them in their course
> The relics of the archer force,
> Like wave with crest of sparkling foam,
> Right onward did Clan-Alpine come
> Above the tide, each broadsword bright
> Was brandishing like beam of light,
> Each targe was dark below ;
> And with the ocean's mighty swing
> When heaving to the tempest's wing,
> They hurled them on the foe"

One is tempted to recall a parallel passage from a later poet·—

> "... as a wild wave in the wide North Sea,
> Green-glimmering toward the summit, bears, with all
> Its stormy crests that smoke against the skies,
> Down on a bark, and overbears the bark,
> And him that helms it—so they overbore
> Sir Lancelot and his charger."

If Tennyson's verse takes the palm for majesty and music, is there not yet a note almost of preciosity in its wording? We have the artist lingering to describe a scene, and choosing crafty terms to heighten his effect The wave pauses before us in air—pauses like a theatrical drop-scene Scott, on the other hand, simply shows us the thing happening, we forget the showman entirely for the moment Style is his servant, not his master, and he cares only that you realise what he himself sees

But we need not depreciate others to admire Scott. He himself would have smiled to be put in comparison with the great world-singers The enormous popularity of his poems, at any rate, is indisputable And no writer did more to disseminate the spirit of Romance. His success, indeed, produced more than one revolution It killed the old bad Grub Street tradition of literature It proved that poems thoroughly healthy in tone could compete with the most highly spiced productions of the Minerva Press. And, to leave literature for a moment, it made the Scotch Highlands fashionable Scott did not indeed discover Loch Katrine, as is foolishly said. Its beauties were known before both to pamphleteer and tourist But he did more than any one else to promote that change of thought which has made the "Highland hills," execrated by Nicol Jarvie, the objects of what can only be called a lover's passion to many of us. And so we come back to literature. For in so far as torrent and cataract, peak and precipice, heather

Influence of his poems

and rock and bracken, haunt our thoughts and inspire our writing to-day, we owe that thought and that inspiration above all men to Walter Scott.

The events of Scott's career are familiar to all. The *Lady* (1810) was followed by *Don Roderick* (1811), an attempt in a new field and a new metre, which the public received with less favour He resumed his old style in *Rokeby* (1812) and the *Lord of the Isles* (1815), neither equal to their predecessors, yet each containing things that only Scott could have written. The same might be said of even the *Field of Waterloo* (1815), which has some stirring passages He also published anonymously the *Bridal of Triermain* (1813) and *Harold* (1817), which people said were as good as the real article, and then were amused to find his own Meanwhile, Byron's star was rising, and Scott's own thoughts turning to prose, as he has described in the delightful prefaces to the 1830 edition of his poems One cannot grudge a change which gave us the Waverley novels. But it is often forgotten that Scott remained a poet to the end The songs, and ballads, and scraps of motto and other verse scattered through his novels form no inconsiderable part of his poetry, and contain some of his very best work. He spoke even better through an imaginary character than with his own mouth. Elspeth's Harlaw ballad in the *Antiquary;* Madge Wildfire's "Proud Maisie" in the *Heart of Mid-Lothian;* and some of the weird rhymes scattered through the *Pirate*, any of his contempo-

Scott always a poet

raries might be proud to own Take but one of the last —

"And you shall deal the funeral dole,
Ay, deal it, mother mine,
To weary body and to heavy soul
The white bread and the wine

And you shall deal my horses of pride,
Ay, deal them, mother mine;
And you shall deal my lands so wide,
And deal my castles mine.

But deal not vengeance for the deed,
And deal not for the crime.
The body to its place, and the soul to Heaven's grace,
And the rest in God's own time."

His lyrics and ballads

Indeed, the judicious lover of Scott's verse will lay even more stress on the short poems than on the long ones which come to mind at mention of his name Tastes change, and versified narrative may go out of fashion, despite fire, and description, and character-drawing, and the rest But songs and ballads never pall. Scott, at his best, equals any of his contemporaries as a song-writer, and excels them as a ballad-writer. Would that the critics who deem his verse "facile" could give us another *Bonny Dundee* or *Macgregor's Gathering!* We would cheerfully exchange much fine talk and subtle sentiment for a swing like

"The moon's on the lake, and the mist's on the brae,
And the clan has a name that is nameless by day"—

or even the more commonplace

"Ah! County Guy, the hour is nigh."

To us, however, the important thing to notice is that Scott, the earliest-known of our romance poets, remained a poet through life, and that his verse, facile perhaps, careless and often commonplace undoubtedly, exercised at its best a widespread influence which it must be held to have thoroughly deserved. His chronological importance secures his place in a history of literature.

Coleridge as poet

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), Scott's master in metric, is a name of different note. The pure element of poetic inspiration was perhaps never more exquisitely embodied than in Coleridge's best verse. As a man, his record is other than Scott's. Dreaming and opium-consuming, he passed his life in gorgeous reveries, of which only scattered fragments took shape in writing. Poetry and philosophy, politics and religion, formed the subject of these. The nobility of his character is attested by the devotion of friends, sorely as he was wont to try their patience. Though "discord on the music fell, and darkness on the glory", though the magnificent promise of his early days was redeemed only in part, enough remains to show what he was. It is as poet we consider him here, and the perfection of his best strains is only equalled by their importance as models. The sonnets of Bowles, the interesting Taylor school at Norwich, the companionship and collaboration of Wordsworth, did much to make him. But the dominant note was original, and may be regarded as the first fully complete Romance note

struck in England. If he did not follow up his own inspiration, he passed it on to others *Christabel* remained a fragment, but it was read and handed round in manuscript, and all his younger contemporaries fed upon its music. *The Ancient Mariner* had no successor from its author, but all succeeding poetry owed something to it The best of Coleridge's verse would go into one very small volume, and does not strictly belong to the period we are considering. But its effect and influence do *Christabel* was first published in 1816, the *Sibylline Leaves*, his first more or less complete collection of poems, in 1817. Till then his poetry was but the delight of a few. In dealing with a national, or rather an international, movement, dates of publication cannot be ignored. The appreciation of Coleridge's gift of song, the recognition of its one year of perfect utterance, belonged to the volume preceding this But in dealing with the Romance Movement at its height we cannot pass by in entire silence one who did more than any other to make it a living thing, and give it the shape it took.

Coleridge's brother-in-law Southey comes next, historically rather than by his own weight or force.

Southey

Robert Southey (1774-1843) was but little younger than his great friends and fellow-workers, and his eager precocity brought him before the public sooner, or at least more fully. In the criticism of his day he bulks as large as any of them; Emerson's later question, "Who is Southey?" is only an expression of somewhat petulant scorn. When

our century was in its 'teens, Southey was living at Keswick that life of splendid and devoted industry, which would earn admiration even had the results been wholly worthless In 1813 he became Poet Laureate, a position, however, which did not then imply pre-eminence He was counted a leader in the "Lake School" of poets, for praise or blame as the case might be. And he had himself no doubts of his ultimate position The same generous enthusiasm which coloured his estimate of friends—which prompted him to declare that than Wordsworth a greater poet never either was or would be—assured him that posterity would acclaim his own poems. Posterity, as yet, shows small wish to do so. *Thalaba* and *Kehama* slumber on the shelf, and the *Battle of Blenheim*, *Hollytree*, and *Stanzas in my Library*, almost exhaust most people's knowledge of Southey's verse. As a writer of admirable prose, we shall meet him later on. As a poet, despite Landor's praise, despite his own confident anticipation, he cannot be ranked high. The best even of what he did was produced before the time we are considering The *Curse of Kehama* came out in 1810, coeval with the *Lady of the Lake*. *Roderick* followed in 1814, and the *Vision of Judgment*, chiefly notable as rousing Byron's keenest satire, in 1821. By this time he felt himself that his vein was exhausted. If *Kehama* and *Roderick* had appeared at a time of less poetical affluence, their success would certainly have been greater. They have undeniable merit, and beside Hayley, Pye, and Darwin for example would have shone indeed But Southey had

giants for his rivals, and could not "live the pace" with them. His honest, meritorious, conscientious verse lacks only the breath of genius. He is perhaps never quite so flat as Wordsworth at his worst; but he never rises with Wordsworth into the highest heaven of poetry. His influence was great for a time, in his early Jacobin destructive days. during these later years it was a thing of the past The Conservative Poet Laureate no longer excited either sympathy or anger, he was a butt for the wits of the new Liberal opposition. Mocked by Canning and Frere in his salad days of youth and inexperience, the author of *Wat Tyler* and *Joan of Arc* lived to be ridiculed by a new race of rebels as the representative of Toryism and official prejudice.

Wordsworth

The oldest and greatest of the "Lake Poets" was William Wordsworth (1770-1850) His share in the new movement had been large and indeed "epoch-making" The publication of *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798 and 1800, and of the two volumes of *Poems* in 1807, were events of immense importance, which however fall outside the scope of the present volume. We take up Wordsworth in middle life. His most inspired work, as has often been pointed out, was done in the ten years preceding 1808 By 1810 he was settling down in opinions and habits The Jacobin passion of youth, the unrest of early manhood, the days of poverty and high endeavour at Dove Cottage, all are left behind. His place in life is taken, the stamp-distributorship has removed financial fears, and eight years of happy

marriage have sweetened and quieted him. As yet, even at the age of forty, he finds his poetry dear only to a few, derided and despised or wholly ignored by most. The *Prelude*, written before 1805, remains still unpublished, and will do so till his death. But the *Excursion* appears in 1814, and is greeted by Jeffrey's famous "This will never do." Meantime, in 1813, some two years after leaving Dove Cottage, he settles into Rydal Mount, his latest and most luxurious home 1815 sees the first collected edition of his minor poems, and the publication of his *White Doe of Rylstone*, in which the public found but a pale imitation of Scott's chivalrous romances The education of his sons recalled him to classical studies, and *Laodamia* and *Dion* (1814) are the happy result. In 1819 the publication of *Peter Bell* marks a completed change in public opinion. Written long before, and fairly open to whatever charges of triviality and mawkishness were brought against his early verse—satirised, moreover, mercilessly by the young bloods of the new era—this poem none the less found readers and purchasers The poet had at last created his public In his fiftieth year, he at length found himself secure of a sympathetic and even subservient audience For nearly a generation yet, the High-priest of Nature will live in honoured old age, his home the Mecca of admiring votaries. But the fire on his altar burned dim and low. Once only, and that so early as 1818, it flamed up with something of its old glow in an *Evening Voluntary;* but when he sang

> "'Tis past! the visionary splendour fades,
> And night approaches with its shades"—

he was bidding semi-conscious farewell to the inspiration of old days. A sonnet now and again—the concluding one of the *Duddon* series (1820), the one on parting from Scott in 1831, or the tender elegiac lines mourning his brother-poets gone to the "sunless land" (1835)—show that in his ashes dwelt the immortal spark. But for the most part he merely lived, and more in the past than the present. The Laureateship in 1843, the Oxford degree four years earlier, were grateful proofs of the affectionate respect of a once hostile world For the seed which fell on such stony ground had struck root and bloomed richly at last, the ideas which former critics never wearied of contemning were now an accepted treasure of English literature, and have never ceased to influence it since

Direction of Romantic Movement

What, exactly, has that influence been? What did the "Lake Poets" eventually do for English literature? We need not stay to consider curiously of names Grant that there never was a "Lake School"—that Wordsworth was Wordsworth, and the others were his friends and admirers, but by no means his followers—the question still remains vital. What marks the new life which these men, more than others, though themselves of course receiving as well as giving inspiration, brought into English poetry? Apart from mere questions of style, two features seem especially characteristic a keener love of the Past, and a keener passion for Nature. Of the first of these Scott is

the chief exponent. With him love of the Past was indeed a master-passion How he studied it, how he lived in it, how he made it live again in his pages, no one needs to be told Critics may call his knowledge shallow; a board-school child can detect errors in his dates. But he began what others have perfected. Compare him with the antiquaries of the previous Century, even with men like Gray, Warton, and Ritson. It is the difference between capable students and masters of a craft. That Scott was but one out of many, that to his contemporaries his zeal and his insight seemed neither unique nor even distinctive—this is of course true No man creates the spirit of an age by himself But Scott voiced and guided it, and called us all to feel and to follow. In this sense he may even be said to have begun the Catholic revival of the next generation. No man was less ecclesiastically minded himself But the outside show, the pomp and pageant of old religion, appealed to him strongly. Born and bred in Presbytery, he adopts Episcopalianism himself, and his family tend toward the more ancient rite Without Scott the Tractarian movement might have shaped itself differently; he and his influence are potent there to this day.

Love of antiquity

But Scott only voiced a common longing. The Eighteenth Century was on the whole content with its own ideal. Its men of letters regarded themselves as the final flower of literary culture; the tradition survives in our quaintly named Augustan age of literature. The Romantic Move-

ment taught entirely different notions and ideals, it sent people back to the Past in the spirit of worshippers rather than critics. No longer despising the rude vigour, the "barbarian" opulence of our forefathers, no longer pitying their ineffectual and antiquated methods of speech, men found grandeur in the thought, and a quaint charm in the diction, of even our ruder literary ancestors, surpassing the trim style and narrow, pithless speculation of authors who fancied themselves classics Lamb's attitude to Shakespeare is a sign of the age Coleridge led or followed with his subtle disquisitions Even the restrictions and excrescences of old writers were idolised Their formal style, their affectations and archaisms, became objects of worship With feebler guidance, the movement would probably have ended in mere antiquarianism. As it was, the new wine of real poetry often gleamed oddly enough in these old-fashioned bottles But the sterling strength, the indubitable ardour, of our great Nineteenth-Century thinkers and singers saved the movement from degeneracy Their love of the Past remained an inspiration, not a cultus; only after they were gone did it tend to lapse into pedantry and euphuism

Love of Nature

The other great influence was their passionate love of Nature. Here Wordsworth predominates, just as Scott in the other field. But it is equally true that the poet of Grasmere was but *primus inter pares.* Appreciation of wild scenery was yet in its infancy. Obviously, indeed, it was difficult to admire rugged landscapes when each bush or crag

might screen a lurking brigand The pacification of the country must precede its leisurely exploration. But the times were now ripe, and the tourist had arisen. He was still an object of respect, still posed as a "pilgrim of nature." Travel had not ceased to be adventure, but it had become also an approach to enchanted castles of fairydom. The Romantic writers were confirmed tourists Scott's Border upbringing, and later excursions into the Highlands, widened his knowledge of nature as of men, Coleridge and Wordsworth travelled, observed, and rhapsodised. Racedown and the Quantocks, Lake-land and Scotland, not to mention Germany and Switzerland, passed into their verse. Inspiration came from rock, and wave, and mountain. Scenery became a study, sublime scenery a rapture. The most superficial comparison of this attitude with that of earlier writers —even of Gray, himself a worthy pioneer in Lake-land and elsewhere—reveals an enormous difference. Grand scenes are now enjoyed for themselves, and the more rugged the better They no longer need art to heighten their effect, or bear being looked at through a "Lorraine glass." The fashion thus set spread like wildfire; every young aspirant, even a delicate Keats, shouldered his knapsack and set forth as pilgrim of nature. And the spirit so created and developed went on constantly growing: in this respect, too, the influence of these men is graven indelibly on the literature of the first half of our Century.

Wordsworth, however, added a deeper note to the

widening chorus Nature, with him, was the object not merely of romantic passion, but of religious devotion. She is sustainer and consoler, but she is something more

Wordsworth a religion

> "Nature never did betray
> The heart that loved her,"

he says in *Tintern Abbey*,—an assertion so sadly falsified in the case of that beloved sister, whose "wild eyes" were lit in later days by gleams of insanity, instead of by the "sober" radiance predicted. In this same early poem he recognises a "presence" in Nature, the sense of which "far more deeply interfused" makes him say

> "Therefore am I still
> A lover of the meadows and the woods
> And mountains"

Didactic through every fibre of him—"every great poet is a teacher," he says himself—he preaches his creed with the persistence of a divine. At first an inspiration, it hardens later into a doctrine or dogma. In the *Excursion* it has become an almost pantheistic idealism, not without its grotesque side. When we are told to forget human crime and suffering by adoring the peace which dwells in

> "plumes,
> And weeds, and the high spear-grass on that wall"

(Book I., end), an unregenerate reader is apt to smile or sigh.

Yet Wordsworth's pastoral poetry at his best is a

noble utterance. In previous ages men had turned from luxury and turmoil to envy the peace that dwelt in "huts where poor men lie" The splendours of Alexandria had thus created the pastorals of Theocritus, imitated by Virgil in days of Imperial pomp The wars and self-indulgence of mediæval Italy sent Sannazaro on the same quest, our own Elizabethans, tired of the Tudor troubles echoed his cry for peace. The pastorals of Pope and Shenstone were mainly amusements or affectations But Wordsworth was earnest if ever man was, and his pastoral poetry came from the heart "High thinking" was to him allied with "plain living"; grave talk, and simplicity of life, were dearer than the brilliance of court or camp The hillside was his study, not merely his "boudoir" or place of amusement He did not "take an inventory of Nature," as he accused Scott of doing; he lived with her, drank deep of her influence, and when inspired gave voice to her holiest teaching. Nature was personal to him, and more than personal; she was the very embodiment and symbol of Deity. It is this deeper note of Wordsworth's that has resounded in all our poetry since; the hermit of Grasmere is still our patriarch and high-priest No later writer has been insensible to his solemn music. Childe Harold himself made an altar of the Alps; Shelley saw in all things living a mirror of "that light whose smile kindles the universe" Even the pagandom of Keats humbled itself before "the Eternal Being, the Principle of Beauty" That all religious feeling is inspired by Wordsworth, it were absurd to

Its abiding influence

contend; but we can hardly err in tracing his influence throughout that particular idealised form of Nature-worship which predominates in our later poetry, and seemed to men like the late Professor Tyndall an adequate substitute for ecclesiastical formulas.

First stage of Movement.

These four names that have now been dwelt on may be taken as representing the first flush and fervour of the Romantic outbreak. Scott with his martial strain, the witching music of Coleridge, Wordsworth's austere and lofty thought, all opened new regions of poetical delight; and Southey pointed thither by precept and example Into these magic realms flocked all lovers of poetry. Critics might blame, and there was much in even the mature work of these writers fairly open to censure. But the public, careless of details, recognised the new voices, the authentic breath from above, and followed gladly where they led. Slowest to win favour was the greatest and most original. Wordsworth's poetry had so much to cause stumbling, so much certain to offend, that it is not wonderful it took time to appreciate. But in the end his influence has been the most potent and enduring. His view may have been one-sided, his protest against convention exaggerated, his emphasising of the trivial itself a mannerism. His claim to use in poetry none but language of common life was early abandoned even by himself. Never was writer more unequal; his "two voices" (to adopt the phase of a witty parodist) differ as a penny whistle from

an archangel's trump We read him in extracts and chosen selections, few have patience to labour through the dull levels of intervening commonplace. But his task was great, and greatly achieved Not so much in prosody as in poetical thought, he worked a veritable revolution, vindicating for poetry whole worlds from which she had been excluded And his own verse, at its highest, is as noble as his thought. It has the freshness, the simplicity, the inevitableness, of a natural phenomenon. If Coleridge is pre-eminently the singer, the "poets' poet," the master of melody, Wordsworth is the poet of thought, the poet who knows as well as feels His "Orphic strain" is seldom long maintained, but while it lasts our heads must be bowed So thought those who knew him in life, so, without serious exception, their children feel to-day. After all discount, all disparagement, Wordsworth at his best is unique and supreme The intensest rapture, the deepest harmonies, the most spiritual aspirations of the Romantic movement are embodied in his verse; they were the daily task and nightly meditation of him who sang—

"By grace divine,
Not otherwise, O Nature, we are thine"

Beside these chiefs of the elder Romantic School, and second only to them in freshness and influence, other notable singers aided in the work of deepening and broadening the channels of our poetry. Some of them were pupils, more were

Dii minores

independent workers; but the Romantic impetus made itself felt throughout their work Love of poetry, and fair skill in verse-writing, were common endowments at this time, we need not linger over volumes which reveal only these accomplishments Even Charles Lamb (1775-1834), for example, may be left to appear later as a prose-writer, his scanty crop of verse interests mainly as a return to Tudor models. But there are some names which cannot be passed in silence, and which will serve to show how wide and varied were the forces which combined in perfecting the Romantic ideal.

James Hogg (1770-1835), the "Ettrick Shepherd," whose life almost synchronised with Scott's, was a self-taught poet, such as Burns is often wrongly supposed to have been At the age of twenty-five, he had forgotten his alphabet, but made verses in his head, learning later with laborious effort both to read and write. Scott discovered and befriended him, and no doubt his patron's influence was a strong factor in his development. But he had a true and living gift of his own. His chief poem, the *Queen's Wake*, which appeared in 1813, contains the piece by which above all else he will live "Bonny Kilmeny," though disfigured by needlessly archaic spelling, is an exquisite piece of pure Scots, and in its own region unsurpassable. As a song-writer Hogg takes high rank. Two or three of his lyrics—"When the kye comes hame," "Donald M'Donald," and the best of his Jacobite effusions—may be called worthy of Burns. But it is

Hogg

as laureate of fairy-land that he attains highest excellence. He wrote also prose stories, *Border Tales* and the like, including one remarkable piece of diablerie (if it be his), the *Confessions of a Justified Sinner* His apotheosis by the authors of *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, a triumph of that mystification in which writers then took boyish delight, has somewhat distorted our perception of the man himself But in his proper person Hogg was a peasant of genius, and perhaps gives a juster notion of the merits and defects of such a character than is afforded by those who would travesty Burns into imaginary agreement with a type he does not nearly so well represent.

Crossing the Border again, we encounter a very different personality, that of Southey's friend Walter Savage Landor (1775-1864) Landor's early romanticism was chastened by "Classical" study properly so called, and his life-long devotion to the poets of Greece and Rome lent his verse some of their stateliness and severity Yet as a poet he stands with the Romantics *Rose Aylmer* is a gem of purest water; the hackneyed "Sea-shell" quotation adequately samples his blank verse, and we may claim for poetry the tenderly touching epitaph on the "Scholar of the Cherwell,"

Landor

> "Litterarum quæsivit gloriam,
> Videt Deum."

To sum up a life-work like Landor's in a single paragraph is profanation But in one respect, in respect of the pure *lilt* of poetry, his genius was defective.

One lyric of lesser singers; one stanza from one poem of his mellifluous panegyrist—

> "I came as one whose feet half linger,
> Half run before;
> The youngest to the oldest singer
> That England bore,"—

outweighs in this respect whole pages of Landor's verse *Non omnia possumus omnes*, and Landor's mighty genius can dispense with this grace His compact, vivid verse stands by itself, as did its writer Owing no man aught; borrowing from no contemporary, influencing writers of his age but little,[1] he "warmed both hands before the fire" of his own thought, and occupies a position wholly his own In some ways he recalls Southey, great men, noble minds, working manfully, both in prose and poetry, but in the latter case not wholly with success. But Landor's was the weightier intellect, the more masculine utterance, he accomplished more, and never deserted the inspiration of his youth It were labour lost to enumerate his publications. Their dates have no significance, they neither affected others nor mark any stage of his own development The poet of *Gebir* (1798) is also the poet of the *Hellenics* (1847) and the *Heroic Idyls* (1863). In English verse or Latin, he remains the same terse, vigorous, sometimes obscure but never affected writer. Massive and lonely, he stands out *ultimus Romanorum*, a giant

[1] This refers to Landor's middle and later life Southey, Coleridge, and Shelley all owned obligations to his early poems

among the pigmies of ephemeral renown. And prose and poetry blend in him so harmoniously, that when we claim a high place for him among English writers we are apt to forget how comparatively small is the part played by his poetry in shaping our estimate.

It is strange to turn from Landor to the *petite* grace of Thomas Moore (1779-1852). The significance of Moore's verse lies partly in its date, both of composition and of publication. Younger than any poet yet named, he anticipated most of them as a writer and as a public influence At the time we are reviewing, he was one of the foremost men of letters, esteemed as song-writer, satirist, and fine gentleman The popularity of his verse has so hackneyed his best vein, that it is difficult for us now to consider it quite seriously Nor can we claim the highest qualities either of meaning or melody for his songs. Yet it is a mistake to disparage them unduly. The "tinkle" may be somewhat obvious, but it is smooth, sweet, and sufficient "When he who adores thee has left but the name" runs to no unworthy measure, "Oft in the stilly night" retains for most of us the charm of our boyhood Critics who condemn the facility of such verses are surely more to seek than the poet Nay, even the verses which halt when read, but fit deftly to the tune in singing, should not be condemned for bad craftsmanship. It is merely a return to the old ideal of blended music and speech. Our modern song-writers seem to have lost this art, and depreciate it accordingly. Take it how we may, the *furore* which

Moore

attended the *Irish Melodies* (begun 1807, finally completed 1834) is an undeniable fact, and not one which seems to need elaborate explanation. Of *Lalla Rookh* (1817) and the *Loves of the Angels* (1821) little need be said. The former at least retains some vitality, in spite of sugary sentiment and carelessly constructed verse. And most readers will thoroughly enjoy the *Fudge Family* (1818) and the *Twopenny Post-Bag* While we no longer rank Moore among the great poets of his time, it seems foolish to go to the other extreme, and ignore his real gift as a writer of pretty, if not of grandly inspired, songs Critics ranked Moore too high at first, and lately have tended to depreciate him as unduly it is safe to predict that his ultimate place will be somewhere between the two positions, but the grosser blunder was made by those who insisted on thrusting him into the first place.

With Moore may be bracketed Thomas Campbell (1776-1844) Like Moore, he began early. But in his case the interesting thing to notice is that he has no original voice of his own. His early *Pleasures of Hope* (1798) merely mimic the style of his day. Then come the new Romantic poets, and Campbell catches their tone. *Lord Ullin's Daughter*, *O'Connor's Child*, and other spirited ballads, reproduce it faithfully but not slavishly *Gertrude of Wyoming*, published in 1810, tells a romantic tale quite in Scott's vein, though for vehicle Campbell adopted not without success the Spenserian stanza His springs dried early, yet the *Last Man*, published late in life, still

Campbell

has admirers, of *Theodric* (1824) the less said the better Settled in London, he did good work as editor and critic But his fame rests on his early writing, especially the three great war-songs, of which *Hohenlinden* and *Ye Mariners of England* were written in 1800, the *Battle of the Baltic* in 1809 With some defects of manner, especially a certain woodenness of phrasing, these poems well deserve the fame they have always enjoyed, nor perhaps have any later singers produced anything quite good enough to oust Campbell from his predominance as a master of the Tyrtæus vein

Leigh Hunt

James Henry Leigh Hunt (1784-1859) was a London contemporary of Campbell's, though a slightly younger man, and forms a link between the earlier and later romantic poets The *Feast of the Poets* was published in 1814, the *Story of Rimini* in 1816 Leigh Hunt had the misfortune to be outclassed by his competitors. His work will not stand wear as theirs does, it is more trifling, more affected, yet by no means an echo On the contrary, he taught more than he learned, his influence was great, his example fruitful. Shelley and Keats profited by him metrically, his contemporaries did more homage to him than we can do A student both of Elizabethan and of Italian poetry, he stimulated the Romantic tendency to copy and enjoy these His life was not ignoble, despite some ignoble elements. The imprisonment for libelling the Prince Regent may be counted for righteousness, the journey to Italy was unfortunate, but only Byron's satire made it seem

degrading One likes to think of his gentle old age, and resents the caricature which labelled him Harold Skimpole But of his actual verse little need survive His fame rests on his friendships, and on some volumes of genially gossiping essays A gay and buoyant spirit carried him through much trouble, and the grass and daisies should grow well over the grave of one who all his life loved flowers and sunshine

To complete our picture of this initial Romantic period, we must bear in mind that verse-writers from an earlier time still lived and flourished. Samuel Rogers (1763-1855) remained a conspicuous figure, though he belonged essentially to the past, and his *Italy*, published at intervals between 1820 and 1834, seems an anachronism Crabbe and Bowles, Gifford and Sotheby, were still prominent, Crabbe in particular putting out some of his best work between 1810 and 1820. Blake devoted himself to apocalyptic visions Mrs Barbauld and Mrs Inchbald, with the venerable Hannah More, still wrote and published, Joanna Baillie lived through all the changes still to be traced. But these lesser lights, to repeat a former metaphor, paled manifestly in the new morning, to whose brightness a group of youthful singers was now about to add more effulgent lustre.

Older survivors

The first of this younger group was George Gordon Noel, Lord Byron (1788-1824). Byron's life and work are facts of far-reaching import. So much may be

granted, whatever our private opinion as to the worth of his poetry No survey of English, still less of European, literature can avoid giving him a prominent position The writer whom Goethe styled the greatest genius of his Century was worshipped abroad as at home, and when he bore through the Continent "the pageant of his bleeding heart," we know that

Second stage of Movement—Byron

> "thousands counted every groan,
> And Europe made his woe her own"

This, indeed, is precisely one of the crucial points in the Byronic problem Let us concede that no foreign critic can ever thoroughly appreciate a poet, that much Greek comment on Æschylus and Euripides is unintelligible to moderns, that even German study of Shakespeare seems to ourselves often strained and beside the mark Allow for all this, and still the strength and unanimity of opinion on Byron's merit is enough to give us pause. He translates well, says one sceptic; the finer aromas which evaporate in the translator's crucible do not haunt Byron's verse, so their loss is not felt. There is something in this, something too in the largeness, rudeness, grandiosity of his figures which makes replica-work easy and successful. But when all is said, there remains more than can be thus explained away. Goethe's homage, Heine's acceptance, the frantic Byron-worship of his day, his conspicuous place still in our libraries, his wide influence and immense sale throughout the Continent of Europe,—these are facts which must be

accounted for. Least of all should those who swear by Goethe depreciate Byron, as for example Carlyle did Eckermann's *Conversations* are full of repeated and deliberate verdicts in Byron's favour "The English may think of Byron as they please, this is certain, that they can show no poet who is to be compared to him" "Were it not for his hypochondriacal negative turn, he would be as great as Shakespeare and the Ancients" "I never saw the true poetical power greater in any man than in him" "A character of such eminence never existed before, and will probably never come again"[1] In the face of such testimony, does it not savour of arrogance to set down Byron as the mere wind-bag and ranter some would have him, his worship as a mania, his influence as a passing whim of fashion? Some survey of what he did for English letters will perhaps enable us to take a juster view.

His life

The facts of Byron's life must be shortly recalled Half a Celt by blood, he was brought up in the Aberdeenshire Highlands, where "his cap was a bonnet, his cloak was a plaid." Passing to Harrow and Cambridge, he published while at the latter place *Hours of Idleness* (1807), a collection of nowise remarkable short pieces The contemptuous criticism this received called forth ***English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*** (1809), a satire on good old-fashioned lines, which first revealed some of his

[1] *Conversations of Goethe* (Oxenford's translation), in Bohn's Standard Library, cf 1823, October 19, 1825 February 24, 1826, March 26 and November 8 and *passim*

power; and then he travelled abroad for two years, returning to publish at the age of twenty-four the first two cantos of *Childe Harold*, written at intervals during these two years of wayfaring. Till now his career had been comparatively commonplace. Idleness and dissipation in London or the Levant are not rare enough to require notice. His satire is remarkably good for twenty-one years old, but many other men have been as precocious. But after 1812, when *Childe Harold* first saw light, the case is widely different. He "awoke and found himself famous." His *Childe* took the public by storm. Here was the "pilgrim of nature" glorified by genius, and passing through scenes more wonderful than our own. And the garb of gloom, the vaunt of self-sufficiency and aloofness, the world-weariness and satiety and premature acceptance of isolation, deepened the chiaroscuro and piqued curiosity. The moody, fantastic, self-important youth had reached his goal at a leap, fame and notoriety were his without stint. Eagerly he accepted the position, however pretending to despise it. Dark tales of mystery flowed from his pen. The *Giaour*, *Corsair*, *Bride of Abydos*, *Lara*, *Siege of Corinth*, and *Parisina* followed in rapid succession during the years 1813-16, besides the *Hebrew Melodies*. In 1815 he married, in 1816 his wife left him, under circumstances still mysterious. Thereupon he quitted England, never to return. For seven more years he lived abroad, first near Geneva, where he met Shelley, and wrote *Manfred*, the *Prisoner* of *Chillon*, and the third canto of *Childe Harold* (1816-17), the rest of the

time in North Italy. Wild stories of his reckless life reached England, and were unfortunately not all false but his productive industry did not flag. In Venice he wrote *Mazeppa*, the fourth canto of *Childe Harold*, and the first four of *Don Juan* (1818-19) At Ravenna, later, the *Prophecy of Dante*, several dramatic works (including *Cain*), and the *Vision of Judgment* (1820-21) Finally at Pisa, in close familiarity with Shelley, he wrote most of *Don Juan*, besides various minor works 1823 saw him sail for Greece, to fight with sword instead of pen against the Turk. He died at Missolonghi in April 1824, not perhaps *felix opportunitate mortis*, but at least laying down life at the age of thirty-six on the threshold of a noble endeavour

Quantity and quality of his work

The immense mass of Byron's work is a thing to note Poets like Gray achieve immortality by strength of a few carefully chiselled pieces. Others fling forth their productions in fiery haste, never stopping to prune or retrench. In this respect Byron suited his age Ours is a time of study, refinement, technique, our poets think less of what they say than of how they say it Then, it was different. Men were full of new ideas, new impressions, new ways of looking at life; the difficulty was to pour out fast enough what they felt and thought. Even Shelley wrote at top speed, leaving blurs and lacunas to fill up later. Scott and Byron were practically *improvisatori;* we must judge them as such, not by our own standards. They would probably have despised our carefulness, our elegancies, our studious research for the best word. Poetry was with

them something more free, and natural, and living Which ideal is best, we need not now discuss, it is only fair to recognise that ours is not the only one possible Poetry is a house of many mansions, we are not bound to dwell in one or even two The more catholic our taste, the wider will be our enjoyment of the varied triumphs of various singers, there is room in an orchestra for the dub of a drum, and even the clash of a triangle If our culture only teaches us to despise ideals other than our own, it is a one-sided culture. Poetry, like wisdom, shall be justified of her children.

Variety of matter

It may be argued that Byron's work is monotonous. The same figures, the same vapourings, recur in each poem This, however, is true only of his earlier pieces Taking his whole range of work, variety and versatility are surely what strike us. He tried many forms of verse, and failed in few. From sacred lyric to witty satire, from melodramatic scene-painting to pure comedy, he passes with assured ease. He is best, perhaps, when laughing at his own raptures, making in one breath his ode and his palinode For indeed he was serious only in vanity. His wretched home-training, and the negative teaching of his age, left him with some superstitions but no faith. Shelley's influence, late in life, did something to elevate But the blasé, battered worldling had no capability of passion left Even Shelley's enthusiasm only prompted more stanzas of *Don Juan.* Typical every way are his last lines, written on his thirty-sixth birthday at Missolonghi One sees them

dashed off in his bedroom, brought down for recitation to admiring friends He is as much in earnest as he can be, but it is to sigh over himself as an "extinct volcano" Yet there is a ring of sincerity which redeems the attitudinising, he is not wholly posing or making believe when he bids himself

> "Seek out—less often sought than found—
> A soldier's grave, for thee the best
> Then look around, and choose thy ground,
> And take thy rest"

"That which I call *invention*, I never saw in any one in the world to a greater degree than in him."

Principal faculty

This sentence, taken again from Goethe,[1] may perhaps help us to understand what our grandfathers admired in Byron It does not mean that he could tell a good story The conduct of his tales, the plot and narrative, never reaches excellence Without the shadowy central figure, there would be very little left in *Lara* and the *Corsair* He has not Scott's power of simple narration When he tried this line in *The Island* (1823), his fully matured powers did not save him from failure But he could create situations, and this is probably what Goethe meant Telling situations, vividly described, rhetorical comment, frequently from his own mouth,—these made up Byron's poetry at its best. The element of melodrama is naturally strong. As for the verse which cost him so little labour, it is manly and fluent, but not melodious. Of the higher grace of poetry it

[1] Eckermann, as before, 24th February 1825

has little. Its cadences do not haunt us; careless dissonances abound. These he heeded about as little as he did grammar He was quite capable of writing "there let him lay," quite capable of ending his best lines with a feeble expletive To our ears these are unpardonable offences But only an age which thinks more of the vehicle than of the thing conveyed, more of the verse itself than of what it expresses, can blind itself to the vitality of Byron's most famous passages.

And that is not all Imperfect as may be his utterance, he has something of the singer's power

Style and metre

His prose writing is capital, but his verse gains something He flowed naturally into metre, such as it was

"There's not a joy the world can give, like that it takes away"—

or,

"She walks in beauty, like the night
Of cloudless climes and starry skies"—

may not be very subtle or recondite music, but they are sufficient for the effect The thought is enhanced by the verse, metre is not a felt restraint, but an added beauty The careless freedom of his verse carries us along, though not without jolts and jars *E pur si muove!* There is virtue in motion Elaborately moulded verse may leave us cold and dead, if we feel it artificial While Byron's thought is highly artificial, his verse is always natural and unaffected. We may laugh at and be tempted to burlesque the former, in the latter we can detect many shortcomings, but no self-consciousness.

A style like this naturally tended to comedy. Residence in Italy called his attention to the Italian humourists Without them he might never have done his best work. For he had no great gift of originality in mere conception. He succeeded best when following lines laid down for him *Beppo*, written in 1817, was the first fruit of this study. The subject is taken from Italian life, for the metre he owns indebtedness to Frere's "Whistlecraft," and may possibly have seen Tennant's *Anster Fair* But both in conception and handling he has bettered his models The metre, in particular, suited him so admirably that he made it his own. *Don Juan* could be written in it at a hand-gallop, by 1821, when he writes the *Vision of Judgment*, he has fully mastered its paces *Don Juan* (1818-23) will probably always be considered his chief work. It shows his strength and his weakness, his wealth and his poverty. As a story it utterly fails The great shapeless mass has neither form nor consistency, and cannot be read consecutively at any price. But the pictures are brilliant, each successive scene holds us, though the scene-shifting business is left to manage itself His powers have full scope. He flits from grave to gay at will, often in the same sentence The moralist finds much to condemn, but the mere poetical critic is free to admire Formless and story-less, but brimming with wit, sarcasm, and laughter whose point is often not far from tears, *Don Juan* reflects fully Lord Byron's mind in its rapid transitions and somewhat bourgeois cynicism,

His genius for comedy

presenting indeed a picture of the "Regency" outlook on things which commends itself as lifelike and clever.

Byron's dramatic pieces remain to consider. These particularly excited the admiration of his German critics. Few of us will endorse that verdict To us they seem stagey and stilted, poor in character and unreal in action. They are meant to read, not to act *Manfred* might possibly be put on the Lyceum stage, *Cain* or *Heaven and Earth* would be hopeless. Of *invention* in the dramatic sense there is little, and the characters sketched are but puppets. In the two sacred dramas we have Byron discussing theology with the divines of his day. Their significance is ephemeral, but they were significant in their time *Marino Faliero* and *The Two Foscari* interest us little, *Werner* and *The Deformed Transformed* only from the standpoints of literature or autobiography In trying drama Byron showed his versatility. Occasionally he struck a good note, realised a favourite effect But on the whole he was happier elsewhere Emulation of Goethe and Shakespeare probably urged him to it, rather than any original instinct It is characteristic that he seldom mentions Shakespeare while freely criticising others Unapproachable supremacy had no charm for Byron, he was not content to admire where it was hopeless to attempt rivalry.

His failure in tragedy

Matthew Arnold has summed up Byron in a couplet—

> "He taught us little; but our soul
> Had felt him like the thunder's roll"

This judgment seems final. Philosophic calm, elemental depth of thought, the seership which is akin to prophecy as well as to insight—these we must not look for in Byron Subtly sweet music, majestic reaches of harmony, are equally not in his line We wrong him if we seek for these, we err if we consider their absence fatal Fire and movement, life and colour, passion and variety, yet remain to impress, and of these Byron has full share They are the qualities which appeal so strongly to his Continental critics In a volume like this, which deals with movements rather than with individuals, which ranks writers rather by their influence than by their absolute attainment, Byron takes necessarily a high place If we regard details instead of wholes, it may seem strangely high. Our present habit of criticism dwells largely on details But it is well sometimes to take a larger view In broadness of execution, in the free liberal sweep of what was perhaps rather a scene-painter's than an artist's brush, Byron stands forth a master Alike in the range of his work and in the impact he made on his contemporaries, he is one of the greatest names of his day And however his critical theories or professional jealousies might estrange him from the Romantic leaders, might provoke him to depreciate Wordsworth and exalt Pope, the whole weight of his example and of his influence, it need hardly be said, was powerfully lent to aid the Romantic movement He himself was, or would fain be thought, Romance personified. He represents the

Criticism and summary

storm and strife, the "frothy spume and frequent sputter," of the movement Sentimentality over-ripe, ready to drop into burlesque, is his pet emotion, lest there should be any mistake, he burlesques it himself To us now, reading in cold blood, the burlesque seems the most successful part of his work, but to the men of his time Byron's serious vein seemed as real and splendid as his comic verse was masterly and mirth-provoking

Shelley

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822) was four years younger than Byron, who yet survived him by two years Son of an English country gentleman, Shelley was utterly unlike his surroundings Unhappiness at Eton embittered his schooldays, and he went to Oxford a precocious rebel. Atheist, vegetarian, revolutionary — these fantastic forms of denial smote his youthful fancy. A foolish pamphlet embroiled him with the authorities, and compelled departure. A more foolish early marriage was soon found irksome, he left his wife, and was shocked when the deserted lady drowned herself By this time he had taken up with Mary Godwin, whom he afterwards married His rustication and first marriage in 1811 (aged nineteen), the appearance of *Queen Mab* in 1813, the separation from his wife in 1814, his second marriage and publication of *Alastor* in 1816, are the chief events of his early life In 1817 Lord Eldon refused him (then twenty-five years old) the custody of his children This led to his leaving England next year He met Byron in Switzer-

land, then settled in Italy, where during the next four years (1818-22) he wrote the *Cenci* and *Prometheus Unbound*, *Epipsychidion*, *Adonais*, and *Hellas* The *Revolt of Islam*, it should have been mentioned, was published the year he left England, having appeared and been withdrawn as "Laon and Cythna" the year before. The first complete collection of his poems was made after his death. For in July 1822, in his thirtieth year, he was accidentally drowned when boating between Pisa and Spezia.

His personal character

Too much has been made of Shelley's early eccentricities The opinions of an undergraduate, even when the youth has genius, need not be taken too seriously. Many a boyhood has been full of "foolish noise," both of opinion and conduct, too many a passion leaves its hapless victim Shelley by no means sinned more than others On the contrary, his standard was high, and his tone tragically earnest. All he did was done in the light of day And, it must be added, he could not imagine himself in the wrong When he bruised himself against the facts of life, his only solution was that the facts should give way Everything seemed possible, in those days of revolt, the essential laws of Nature could be classed with human institutions Abolish priests and kings, and men would be virtuous without compulsion, laws involved degradation, to the maker and the obeyer. Many a lad has aired such notions Shelley's position made his acts conspicuous, and "society" was shocked to find this monster in its fold. But the pupil of Godwin, the

satirist of Lord Eldon, the rebel against law and marriage and custom, do not make up the Shelley we know They represent his callow stage, taken too seriously, and in some few respects never quite outgrown. The Shelley of 1816 to 1822 is alone important to literature. And his is a singularly pure and elevated, in one sense saintly, character Beside his friend Byron he shows "Hyperion to a satyr." Bright and winsome, if still somewhat irresponsible, his spirit, like his poetry, burned clearer and steadier to the end His outlook always widened, his insight into life and thought deepened, his religious feeling began to get play, and the extravagance of early rebellion was being rapidly discarded. With both art and power of thought continually developing, it is hard to say where he would have stopped. Did we not know that already the frail body was yielding under the stress and strain of that indomitable spirit, we might believe that Shelley's death robbed literature of glories scarce second to those of any writer of our language Even as it is, we need not stay to claim for him "unfulfilled renown"; his actual achievement ranks him among the greatest masters

Perfection of his method

The poems written after he left England—all that went before is remarkable mainly for crudity and promise—represent the highest stretch, the very topmost reach, of the Romantic movement in verse The heir has come to his own, and takes secure possession It is hardly possible to imagine all that is best in the Romance spirit—its

warmth, its spirituality, its love of light and liberty and colour—finding fuller or more adequate expression. Succeeding singers may subtilise and refine, they may discover new forces in words, more exquisite harmonies of sound But they can scarcely travel in the path of pure poetry beyond the point Shelley reached. The swift clearness of his style, its glow, its radiance, its exulting sense of movement and freedom, constitute an almost ideally perfect expression of the high thoughts that pulsed through his brain. Such poems as the *Cloud*, the *Skylark*, the last chorus of *Hellas*, or any of the short lyrics which he flung forth so freely during the last two or three years of his life, have a directness which seems to belong rather to inspiration than to art. As a specimen of the fully consummated verse of the Romantic period in England, read the last seven stanzas of *Adonais*, of which may be quoted the culmination and conclusion.

"Why linger, why turn back, why shrink, my heart?
Thy hopes are gone before: from all things here
They have departed, thou shouldst now depart!
A light is past from the revolving year,
And man, and woman, and what still is dear
Attracts to crush, repels to make thee wither
The soft sky smiles, the low wind whispers near
'Tis Adonais calls! Oh, hasten thither!
No more let life divide what death can join together

That light whose smile kindles the universe,
That beauty in which all things work and move,
That benediction which the eclipsing curse
Of birth can quench not, that sustaining Love
Which, through the web of being blindly wove

By man and beast and earth and air and sea,
Burns bright or dim, as each are mirrors of
The fire for which all thirst, now beams on me,
Consuming the last clouds of cold mortality

The breath whose might I have invoked in song
Descends on me; my spirit's bark is driven
Far from the shore, far from the trembling throng
Whose sails were never to the tempest given
The massy earth and spherèd skies are riven!
I am borne darkly, fearfully, afar!
Whilst, burning through the inmost veil of heaven,
The soul of Adonais, like a star,
Beacons from the abode where the Eternal are"

Matthew Arnold's criticism

It is strange that the last-cited critic should have described Shelley as a "beautiful but ineffectual angel, beating luminous wings in the void"[1] For, in verses like those just given, what strikes us is surely strength no less than beauty, masculine vigour wedded to ethereal grace. Such criticisms seem to have reference mainly to Shelley's immature work In youth, no doubt, while still learning his powers, still groping for expression, he often leaves an impression of unreality. Beautiful images, exquisite but far-drawn fancies, come to him almost too quick for utterance We are carried through fairy worlds, where nothing seems familiar or human. You might as well "go to a gin-shop for a leg of mutton," to use his own phrase, as expect reality from him But his later verse is less open to this charge Intercourse with Byron had done some-

[1] *Essays in Criticism*, Second Series (1888); compare end of essays on *Byron* and *Shelley*

thing, study of Plato and other masters very much His thought has become more coherent, less visionary, more human. His expression is terse in its rapidity, and manly in its gentleness Take but these lines from another chorus of *Hellas*:—

"Worlds on worlds are rolling ever
From creation to decay,
Like the bubbles on a river
Sparkling, bursting, borne away.
But they are still immortal
Who, through birth's orient portal
And death's dark chasm hurrying to and fro,
Clothe their unceasing flight
In the brief dust and light
Gathered around their chariots as they go"

The vigour of these verses is as great as their beauty A whole system of philosophy is condensed into the last six lines Matthew Arnold never expressed his thought more succinctly, more completely, more luminously. To call Shelley's later verse "ineffectual" is to call Samson weak and Achilles slow-footed. The radiant clarity of his utterance is only equalled by the depth of meaning which underlies it

Shelley's ideal world was a region "where music and moonlight and feeling are one." A later writer points us "There where law, life, joy, impulse are one thing" The later ideal is nobler, and Shelley's maturest verse was rapidly approaching it But his life broke off short, and left us only his matchless lyrics. These grew stronger as well as sweeter to the last. By his lyrics, above all, he will live. They are the crown of his life-work

Ideality and lyric gift

His longer poems lose their grip as they recede from the song-form, *Prometheus Bound* is mainly a gigantic lyric. Even the *Cenci*, his first and last study in pure drama, owes much of its power to the "lyrical cry" which pervades it The singing faculty was Shelley's supreme endowment If not, like his own Apollo, the

> "eye by which the universe
> Beholds itself, and knows itself divine,"

he was the voice by which she proclaims her divinity. "All thoughts, all passions, all delights" became vocal in Shelley's songs; it seems less as if he sang them than that they freely sang themselves There is little of straining, little of difficulty in expression, little of obscurity or wilfulness in his wording The expression is as natural as the thought, if fantastic or thin-drawn, it is to suit the subject No greater mistake can be made than to call Shelley "ineffectual" so far as pure song is concerned, the precision of his touch is as conspicuous as the aerial grace of his melody.

It is difficult to avoid language of hyperbole in speaking of Shelley's manhood His life, his character, his poetry, all have something unearthly in their loveliness. We mourn his early death, for our own sake, grudging what Fate has withheld from us. But he had done enough for fame. His place is assured, and it is among the supreme few While men remain what they are, while the eternal verities of poetry demand expression, we feel that Shelley's immortality is secure. The

Charm of his personality

literary historian sees in his verse the zenith of the Romantic Movement. But in himself, apart from creeds and schools, there dwelt something rarer, more unapproachable, than our formulas can fathom His radiance and his mastery remain the marvel of our song His example and influence can never be discarded, "his name and fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

Keats

The name of "Adonais" among mortals was John Keats (1795-1821). Born of respectable parents in London, he received a limited education, and was early apprenticed to a surgeon. But his genius owed little to circumstance. This Cockney stripling had the most Greek soul of his age. Chapman's old-world rendering revealed to him the majesty of Homer, Lempriere's Dictionary the beauty of gods and goddesses. It seemed as if something akin spoke out clear within him Poetry, therefore, early claimed him. We have wellnigh forgotten the myths that grew up around Keats The effeminate youth, slain by a hostile critique, existed but in imaginative minds, and survives for us but in Shelley's well-starred pity The real Keats was very different We know him for a man strong, sane, and self-contained by nature, luxurious yet capable of austerity, and master of himself till disease and hopeless passion weakened his powers. His Letters to Fanny Brawne are but outcries under terrible pain, and should have been left in oblivion. But his attitude to criticism was both manly and modest "Praise or blame has

but a momentary effect on the man whose love of beauty in the abstract makes him a severe critic on his own works" His prefaces show that this saying came from his heart Striving ever upward, he regards each stage reached as but the stepping-stone to something higher This is not the soul that could let itself be "snuffed out by an article"

His short life

Dismissing the legendary, then, let us look at the true Keats The first thing to remember is that he died aged twenty-five At the same age Shelley had not found himself. It were absurd to look for fully formed powers, perfect or even adequate achievement. But his progress had been marked and rapid The "Cockney poets" taught him something, Leigh Hunt in particular to break up the heroic couplet into more fluid and sequent verse. And he soon distanced his instructors. His early poems show promise rather than performance, much that he himself condemned has survived through the mistaken zeal of friends. *Endymion*, published in 1818, first tried him fully, revealing his enthusiasm for beauty, and his singular power of vivifying Greek legend. But he regarded it himself as mainly an exercise. *Hyperion*, begun the same year struck a new note, beyond his power to sustain, and remains a magnificent fragment. By this time consumption had seized him All his finest work, *Lamia*, *St Agnes' Eve*, the two Odes, and the ballad *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, were written (1819-20) after full health had left him. Disease increasing, his last winter was spent in Italy, where the devoted love of his friend Severn

did what care could to make exile endurable. But his strength sank, and four months after his twenty-fifth birthday his body was laid to rest in the Roman cemetery.

Character of his work

"A feverish attempt, rather than a deed accomplished." So Keats speaks of his poetry, but his hearers account him too modest. There is more than promise in his later poems, there is high performance, valuable in itself, and still more for its influence on his successors To us, in this volume, Keats is a remarkable writer, for he pointed the way to all who came after. If Shelley represents the zenith of the Romantic School proper, Keats may be styled the earliest Neo-Romantic. A time must come when the original movement would exhaust itself. The very perfection of Shelley's best verse discouraged imitation Its secret is incommunicable, he has admirers, but no followers Keats, dying when he did, had already shown the possibility of new developments Before the original impetus was spent, Keats directed it into new channels The followers whom he has influenced trust less to inspiration than to art, or rather, they sedulously seek the aid of art to enhance their inspiration. If the free music of Shelley cannot be rivalled, they will make up for it by care, and culture, and striving after perfection. In tracing the origin of this movement to Keats, it is by no means wished to belittle his genius. The most striking character of this boy's work is that it was so original and so fruitful.

We must not, indeed, forget that it was boy's work.

Immature, yet important

The sensuous detail of which some make so much is a natural heritage of youth So far as it was in excess, it would have been worked off soon, as we see already beginning in his later poems His hand strengthens, his touch is firmer, up to the last. Yet "boy's work" is too poor a phrase for this young man's writing In some ways he was precociously mature. He could sum up the whole Romantic yearning in one couplet, worthy of Shelley himself, when he spoke of

> "Magic casements, opening on the foam
> Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn"

He could write majestic blank verse in that wondrous opening of *Hyperion*, Miltonic only in conception, but all his own in execution If Coleridge gave the keynote for his mysterious ballad, its music and compression bespeak the master. The *Grecian Urn* has the statuesque dignity of Greek sculpture, the *Nightingale* pants with the passion and pathos of our own day. The *Eve of St Agnes* is luscious, but its sweetness is pure sugar, not "poisonous honey stol'n from France" And, more noteworthy still, in perfection of phrase, in *curiosa felicitas* of epithet, he is equal to any, and calls no man (save perhaps some Elizabethan) master. This is again a thing both remarkable in itself and fruitful in its influence: succeeding writers have not failed here to make the most of his example

With Shelley and Keats the full splendour of Romantic Triumph comes to an end. The leaven which had revolutionised our literature had done its

work, old things had passed away, all had become new

Succession to Keats

What might come next was still uncertain. In the light of later development we are able to read in the verse of Keats hint and promise of the future But at the time this could not be visible Years were to pass before the seed Keats sowed could spring up and bear fruit Had he and his great compeers lived, the course of English literature might have been different Their light and leading would have guided to new paths, held up new models for imitation As it was, a time of lesser achievements followed, an *interregnum* devoid of lawful sovereigns But, throughout this transition period, the Romantic impulse still held unchallenged sway, and at its close, as we shall see, that impulse is found still dominant, only modified in scope and direction

Writers of transition period

Keats, Shelley, and Byron died in the 'Twenties of our century, Coleridge, Scott, and others early in the 'Thirties "Brother followed brother to the sunless land" Poetry thus lost its natural leaders The field was left to lesser men, while the coming heroes of a new age practised their weapons These "lesser" writers have enriched our anthologies, and much indeed that they have given us will not readily be let die Heber and Milman and Keble, Hood and "Barry Cornwall," Praed and Macaulay, Talfourd and Sir Henry Taylor, Allan Cunningham and Motherwell, Peacock and Beddoes, Darley and Wells—with Mrs Hemans and

Sara Coleridge, and comic verse from *Rejected Addresses* (1812) to the *Ingoldsby Legends* (1837)—might well give us prolonged pause The list is but begun, and suggests work of most varied interest. *The Christian Year*, *Lycus the Centaur*, *Songs of the Affections*, *Lays of Ancient Rome*, *Ion* and *Philip van Artevelde*, *Death's Jestbook*, *Joseph and his Brethren*—the mere enumeration of these titles reminds us how much there is to study, how much to enjoy, in these "transitional" poets But there will hardly be found anything of plastic importance, anything of quite new departure No one of these writers can be said to have moulded his age, taught fresh secrets of song, at any rate in serious verse,[1] in playful or serio-comic Hood and Praed were perhaps new voices. And the influence of the great leaders had apparently reached its natural term The original Romantic impulse seemed spent. A period of decadence and stagnation might reasonably have been expected to follow The next generation, it might have been thought, would be content to study and annotate the work of its precursors

Neo-Romantic revival

Our fates, however, were more kind, and a different series of events was in store The history of English poetry is full of such surprises. Regeneration comes when least looked for Keats had apparently sung to deaf ears. But a younger race, younger than any of the writers hitherto named, had studied his lesson The neo-Romantic reaction awaited

[1] Some critics, however, will have it that Darley and Beddoes opened strange by-ways of access to the "Romantic vague"

its readers. These appeared at length in three young singers, all of whom began under Scott and Byron, went on to worship Shelley and Keats, and were now to develop along lines of their own Their names were Elizabeth Barrett, Alfred Tennyson, Robert Browning The years which gave them birth were fruitful of great minds, leaders in science, politics, art, grew up with and around them. But in poetry these three were the protagonists, none of them immediate predecessors or coevals came near their pre-eminence. Some account of their several standpoints, and criticism of their earlier work, will close this sketch so far as English poetry is concerned.

Elizabeth Barrett

Miss Barrett, afterwards Mrs Browning (1806[1]-61), was the oldest of the three As a child she longed to run away in boy's clothes and be Byron's page; his death seemed the end of all things. Country-bred, Elizabeth Barrett loved both Nature and books She studied Greek, read voraciously and widely, and wrote verses from the very first Yet she published nothing till her twenty-sixth year. The singular mistake which reckoned her three years younger than she was—a mistake shared even by her husband—throws uncertainty on many statements by her friends. Thus the translation of *Prometheus Bound* is said to have been made before she was twenty; possibly the true figure is twenty-

[1] There seems now no doubt that the true date of her birth is 6th March 1806

three. This, her first publication, appeared in 1835, but was afterwards rewritten. *The Seraphim* came out in 1838, the *Romaunt of the Page* in 1839. With the publication of *Poems*, 2 vols., 1844, her earlier life may be said to close. In 1846 she married Robert Browning, and for fifteen years of ideal union the two poets lived together, mostly in Italy. To this period belong her most ambitious works, including *Aurora Leigh* (1856). Our concern is only with her earlier writing, with Miss Barrett, not with Mrs Browning. It is the young aspirant, the fresh voice, the search after and revealment of new methods of work, that we have here to study, her final attainment, and completed volume of song, must be left to the hands which take up the tale where we leave it.

Her aims and method

Miss Barrett, while the oldest, was perhaps the least original of the three new poets. Sometimes she seems but Mrs Hemans raised to a higher power. An incomparably higher power, of course, wider outlook, stronger thought, far greater mastery of song. But the attitude varies little from the earlier Romantic one; it is chiefly the expression that is different. The same love of chivalry, of pathos, the same leaning to excessive sentiment, we might name her ultra-Romantic rather than neo-Romantic. This plethora of sentiment appears in her lately published *Letters*, as in her poetry; irreverent readers have dared to call it *gush*. What distinguishes her from her predecessors is, *first*, the strength and daring of her imagination, and, *second*, the self-conscious straining of her style. Art has been called in to sup-

plement Nature Miss Barrett was student and critic, as well as singer. All treasures of English poetry were familiar to her She was strenuous as well as eager, and worked at verse-making even when most inspired. Many of her methods were her own, some not too happily chosen Her "bad rhymes," for instance, were not due to carelessness, but to what she imagined an attempt to develop the use of *assonance* in our language This we know from herself And all the secrets of her art, all the lessons learnt from such loving study of our literature as is revealed in her *Book of the Poets*, she expended enthusiastically on her own attempts

Defects of her style

The result has its defects as well as merits. Words are never left to discharge their natural duty, they must be twisted and strained to express something further And the same applies also to thought She is never content with elemental realities, but must be always striving to enhance her idea by added ornament. The free, swift flow of even Shelley's verse would not satisfy her, it must swirl and tumble amid rocks and in little cataracts Hers is the very antithesis of the improvisatore style, even when her utterance is most rapid and hurrying Artifice is always present, as well as art Thus, in *Cowper's Grave*, the thought is clear and noble, and might have been left to produce its proper effect Peace and quiet might have reigned in the telling But this was not her way. She must be ever surprising us with something unexpected and forceful. She bids our grief "as low as silence languish", her hares look up with

"sylvan tenderinesses" in their eyes The thought, fine as it is, moves with staccato jolts, like the wording Daring she always is sometimes her "vaulting ambition" defeats itself From earth to heaven, from man to God, she hurls us in a moment, and when, as a climax, the gaze of Redemptive Love is pictured as "those deep, *pathetic* eyes," the jar is painful. If Miss Barrett had attempted less, if she could have believed that sometimes the half was more than the whole, her success would have been less flawed by weakness.

Absence of simplicity

Artifice is a main characteristic of this young writer's method She represents reaction from the older and simpler, more direct, utterance of the great Romantics to the self-conscious, laboured, studied verse of their successors. It is no longer enough to say a thing perfectly. The older verse, at its best, had an air of completeness, of inevitableness, you could not fancy its thought expressed otherwise The new has the perfection of consummated labour, it might have been put in twenty other ways, but we admire the skill which shaped it thus Art and learning play as much part as inspiration, moulding the raw material of poetry into form If Keats marked the turning-point between the two schools, Miss Barrett is the first example of the newer. She is still the child of the Romantic Movement, her hyper-æsthesia is but its sentimentality redeemed by genius. For genius this woman-writer possessed indeed. No poetess of whom we have record comes near her in breadth and fulness; others have sung more perfectly, but not Sappho herself felt more intensely

She is always at white-heat, the trouble is that she sometimes leaves her readers cold We are concerned here with her art, almost more than with her genius For this method of hers set, or at least emphasised, a prevailing fashion Other writers copied her faults, while doing homage to her brilliance. The stress and strain of later verse, the mouthings of our "Spasmodic School," the lack of simplicity and directness and naturalness, trace themselves largely to her. Great singer when at full height learned critic and accomplished woman—womanly to the heart of her, in her strength and her weakness, her intensity and her self-devotion — she did harm as well as good to our literature. Perhaps, when times have changed, when her theories are forgotten, and her political and social verses have lost the interest of actuality, she will live most of all by her *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, revealing a woman's heart of hearts with all the tenderness of truth and luminous glow of genius

Alfred Tennyson

Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1809-92), was the master-poet of his age From the first his supremacy was undisputed In undergraduate days his Cambridge "apostles" worshipped him; his "magic music" might be known only to a few, but those few were faithful. Of course he had to make himself, and to become known, there were not wanting adverse critiques, sarcastic or even contemptuous references. But these were barely enough to rouse him, never sufficient to cause mistrust. His devotion to poetry knew no alloy. Even love and

marriage could not tempt him into money-making He lived a hermit, till poetry brought riches At a quite late date, no prose sentence of his had seen light. He stood as poet or nothing, faithful to his vocation, and cheered by the unfailing sympathy of friends The events of his life hardly need recalling. His Lincolnshire boyhood and schooldays, Cambridge and London experiences, and later habitation at Farringford and Aldworth, are familiar to us all In 1850 he published *In Memoriam*, wedded after long waiting, and became Poet Laureate in succession to Wordsworth This may be considered the turning-point of his career, the end of his days of uncertainty and apprenticeship. The artist has forged his tools, and has now only to use them

His slow growth

It is the Alfred Tennyson of days prior to this that we have to consider As a boy, he already feels the music of song, the sonorousness of words Yet he, too, confesses to Byron's rule, "Byron is dead" he kept repeating to himself, unable to credit it. Soon, however, the young mind transferred allegiance to Shelley, and still more to Keats, whose influence on him was immense If any one has caught up Keats' unuttered song, it is surely Tennyson When only fourteen, he had written verses of distinct self-origin, and manifesting a true voice. But the voice gets muffled by layers of embroidery. His first published poems are full of mannerism and affectation, whimsical more than imaginative The jeers of profane critics sting, but also strengthen For ten years he labours in silence 1830 and 1832 had seen

his first serious attempts, 'Poems by two Brothers" (1826), *Timbuctoo*, and other non-published work having preceded. It was not till 1842 that he came forward again. This time victory was assured. The old poems had been mercilessly revised, many omitted entirely while the new were of a high level. Some good critics think he never surpassed the poems published in 1842. At any rate, from that time onward his hold on the public was secure. *The Princess* (1847) was the first of a series of masterpieces. Surely, though by slow degrees, he won fame. Fame and fortune in reasonable measure came to him. Other singers rose, and Tennyson's writings ceased to be the exclusive delight of a cultured few. But the matured humanity of a nation and universal interest by much new work of his old age. And no serious attempt has yet been made to displace him from his place as foremost poet of the Victorians.

There is indeed a tendency to consider him mainly as artist. "A second-class mind, with first-class powers of expression," he was lately called. This verdict seems due partly to want of historical knowledge. Tennyson was not an "epoch-making" thinker. It may be doubted if that is the function of a poet, whose work is surely rather to gather up and express perfectly the best thought of his day. This Tennyson has admirably done. His phrases have so become part of ourselves, so much necessities of our intellectual equipment, that we forget they were once fresh and novel. The "infant crying for the light," the doubts that "faintly trust

Not an artist.

the larger hope," seem commonplace now. When *In Memoriam* appeared, however, it was thought profound, "original," mysterious The hero of one of Miss Braddon's early novels hailed it as a "Gospel of the Nineteenth Century." We must not let Tennyson's very success as a renderer of thought blind us to his merit This speculative vein deepened with age The mysticism and spirituality native to his family found ever-increasing expression His associates felt him prophet as well as poet, and 'entered his study as if it were a shrine." When natural reactions have come and gone, and posterity with clear eyes appraises the verse of our Century, it is certain that Tennyson's will be given a high place, and probable that other qualities will be esteemed and admired beside his purely artistic faculty.

This last, however, is our main concern at present. And as to this there can be no dispute In early days it led toward mannerism, namby-pamby-ism, effeminate delight in mere sound. Critical strictures made him aware of this, and he acknowledged their justice by cancelling or altering whole poems And throughout life his weakness as well as strength lay in excess of artistry A certain kinship to preciosity, a disposition to make too much of the mere vehicle, has been already noted. He once gave as his best verse "And mellow ouzels fluted in the elm," valuing it mainly for its sound In this respect Tennyson's example has been potent If Keats influenced him, he has influenced all later poets, Browning not excepted. But the influence

But essentially artistic

has been mainly for good Some excesses there have been, but against this must be set the widespread benefit. "All can raise the flower now, For all have got the seed" And the luxuriant parterres of later poetry, with their colour and freshness and fragrance, must have been other than what they are but for this magic gift.

His teaching and influence.

Tennyson's own master seems to have been Virgil. And we can fancy critics in Augustan Rome censuring Virgil's artificialism. It is not a natural growth, this flower of Tennyson's rearing, not the blue-bell of Scott, or the wild daffodil of Wordsworth. It is a many-coloured tulip, rich in its tints, and heavy with fragrance But it is a true and living growth. We cannot say that "Half-conscious of the garden-squirt, The spindlings look unhappy." Art has fostered it, loving care has shielded, the sunny garden has drawn forth its full size and strength and beauty. But it is Nature's still at heart, and the Divine air its breath of being Some may prefer the desert wild-flower, the field-daisy or the mountain-heather. But the gardener's pride is legitimate. Keats gave our poetry this "garden" turn, after the free growth of the early Romantics. Tennyson caught it up, and above all others trained and developed it. For this, if for no more, he is important. The critic of *Fatima* and *Oenone*, *Tithonus* and *Ulysses*, the *Lady of Shalott* and the *Palace of Art*, the *Two Voices* and the *Lotos-eaters* and *Break, break, break!* knows that there is far more than this. Such poems, and many others of as early date, how-

ever familiarity may stale them for the present, are a deathless possession of the English tongue. But in this history of a movement, we lay emphasis naturally on what contributes to its force—on what is fruitful, germinal, seedful Much beyond the form of Tennyson's verse is thus important. Its tone, its colour, its luxuriance, its studied art, its elaboration of music—these may perhaps be bracketed with "form." His attitude toward science, toward philosophy, toward life and thought and religion; his politics, his patriotism, the aggressively English and "Liberal-Conservative" view he takes of all things—these belong to matter, not to manner Hardly one of these but is important, hardly one but has made followers and founded a school. But, taking him all in all, it is "artistic development" that sums up his lesson to English literature. the artist side of him, beyond all others, is of supreme importance in the poetical history of his time.

Robert Browning

Robert Browning (1812-89) had the most alert, "enquiring," and individual mind of the three His upbringing favoured independence Londoner born and bred, he went to no public school or college—save one winter attending some lectures in Gower Street— and "Italy was his university." London and Italy are the dominant notes of his life. Secure of a competence, he gave himself up to art, inclining strongly to both music and painting, but finally choosing verse as his medium. After early travel, he lived as a bachelor in London, spent most

of his married life in Italy, and returned as a widower to London. There he continued to dwell thenceforth, making annual excursions abroad. To poetry he was constant throughout, in evil report and good report, amid the contempt of early days and the applause of later. His energy never flagged, his production never ceased—though for nine years of his married life he refrained from publication—till he died, full of years and honours, in his son's house at Venice

Small powers may be crushed by University training; Browning's would probably have been regulated. As it was, he grew wild at will Sensitively alive to the spirit of his time—its restlessness, its hysterical longings, its passion for universal knowledge—he mirrors all these in his verse The artistic side of Keats did not appeal to him as to Tennyson. Shelley was his idol, and though he studied and valued Keats, his ideal song was swifter, less restrained, more intellectual. One early piece—"Heap cassia, sandal-buds," &c—is a manifest study after Keats But *Pauline* (1833), his first published poem—subsequently withdrawn, afterwards reprinted by request—is full of Shelley, and nobly owns its debt Artist to the core, Browning had yet a contempt for mere art Lifelong admiration for and friendship with Tennyson did not bias him to imitation Rather it tended the reverse way, urging him to make his own path *The soul in action*—this alone he held worth attention. For the smooth flow of verse he had too much scorn. Musical he could be—natural music came to him unsought, as it must

His habits of thought

come when expression is adequate — but he never went aside to seek it Contemptuous of syllabub, he aspires to pour us neat wine—"stark strength, meat for a man"—and his wine can be both muddy and heady. Preternaturally quick of thought himself, he assumes equal quickness in his readers. Hence his so-called "obscurity," really due to rapid transitions, recondite references, and a breathless hurrying out of fresh ideas He himself disclaimed being wilfully obscure, he even tried to rewrite *Sordello* more intelligibly. In later life, no doubt, the oracular habit grew on him, he hugged his mysteriousness, and complacently called himself our "enigmatic" poet. But we have to do only with his earlier years. In these, it seems certain that he was surprised to find himself difficult, and the want of perception why this should be, the inability to express himself more precisely and fully, may fairly be regarded as due to defective training

Neglect of early poems

Pauline was published anonymously, and might be dismissed in haste as mere prettiness. *Paracelsus* (1835) was his first acknowledged production. Defective in form, it challenges attention by some glorious passages, and these met due recognition *Strafford* (1837) and *Sordello* (1840) confirmed his place among our poets; Wordsworth and Landor toasted him as their successor Yet, we all know, for many years his books were unsaleable. Praise he might get, but no pudding, not indeed even salt for his porridge Vainly he published most remarkable work in *Bells and Pomegranates*

(1841-46), a cheap series with a characteristically far-fetched title. Vainly his plays were acted, his poems printed. In the future, a Rossetti might copy out *Pauline*, and write to ask if it were indeed his; "Owen Meredith," Roden Noel, and Augusta Webster would hail him master But as yet, up to his marriage in 1846, nay to the end of the 'Forties and well into the 'Fifties, his name was known to few His noble wife chafed to find herself praised, him ignored. His influence on the literature of our period was therefore small indeed

The fault his own

For this he had himself mainly to thank "O British Public, ye who like me not," he wrote even in 1868, when it had become something of an anachronism. But the public had reason for misliking Intellectual waywardness was rewarded in kind "Less matter with more art" would have secured Browning's welcome at any time And no man could have given this more easily. On all technical points, not merely of metrical structure but of general composition—handling and draughtsmanship, what to select and what avoid—he was beyond question an expert Not the power, but the will, can have been lacking. Artist and student of verse, he should have had a higher ideal of the expression as well as the conception of poetry. Form may not be everything, but it is a condition of incalculable importance, a necessary element in the highest success. We cannot acquit him of wilful disregard for some fundamental principles of his chosen art.

The misfortune mutual

Yet the public lost much too. Browning's earlier verse lacks little of its matured power His genius flowered early and bore fruit long High thought, strong passion, eager vision, relentless tracking of the human soul through all disguises of speech or action—these were there to find, could but his contemporaries have known to seek. Browning's lynx-eyed scrutiny omitted no corner of human affairs His photographic snapshots are as vivid as they are swift. Above all, his strong sense and masculine vigour would have been invaluable correctives for much that was faulty then. It is interesting to speculate what might have followed his earlier popularity. He himself might have profited by adequate criticism,—might have clarified his brew, and strained out more of the lees These things belong to the "might have been" But one cannot help regretting that Browning gave himself and his readers no better chance of coming to a mutually profitable knowledge.

Conclusion

Here, however, it is time to make end. We began with the elder Romantics in mid-vigour of life. We leave off with the neo-Romantic leaders similarly in their zenith of genius The foregoing survey has traced the Romantic Triumph—in this country, and in its most characteristic form, that of pure poetry—through successive stages of maturity, decay, and renovation It is next incumbent to follow this movement, at home, into regions where its working may seem less obvious. Imag-

inative poetry was its most natural expression, but is very far from being its only or even its most important one The widespread activity and many-sided influence of the Romantic Movement is precisely what justifies depicting it in such detail. And it will be found that no department of what can be called in any sense literary labour escaped the leavening influence of this great principle.

CHAPTER II.

FICTION AND LIGHT LITERATURE.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOVEL—SCOTT'S PREDECESSORS—HIS OWN METHOD —TRUTH TO LIFE—OUTSIDE AND INSIDE—HIS PERSONAL HISTORY —HIS RELATION TO ROMANCE—HIS IMMENSE INFLUENCE—SISTER NOVELISTS—MISS AUSTEN HER ATTACK ON ULTRA-ROMANTICISM —MISS EDGEWORTH—MISS FERRIER—OTHER CONTEMPORARIES— GALT—IMMEDIATE FOLLOWERS—INFLUENCES OTHER THAN FICTION —JOURNALS—THE MAGAZINE PROPPER—ITS LITERARY VALUE— CHARLES LAMB—SOUTHEY—COBBETT—HAZLITT—DE QUINCEY— JOHN WILSON—JOHN GIBSON LOCKHART—THE BLACKWOOD SCHOOL —VARIETIES—TRAVEL LITERATURE—THE DRAMA TRAGEDY— COMEDY—CARLYLE: LATENESS OF DEVELOPMENT—NOVEL RESUMED —BULWER LYTTON: FAULTS AND MERITS—THACKERAY HIS ATTITUDE TO ROMANCE—CHARM OF MANNER—INFLUENCE AND TEACHING—DICKENS HIS UPBRINGING AND POPULARITY—RELATION TO THACKERAY—METHOD AND MANNERISMS—DISRAELI: HIS HABIT OF THOUGHT—OTHER NOVELISTS—THE BRONTË FAMILY—PLACE OF CHARLOTTE BRONTE—ROMANTICISM AND DEMOCRACY—POPULARISING OF KNOWLEDGE—RUSKIN—'PUNCH'—MISCELLANEA—CONCLUSION

A REMARKABLE feature of the time we are considering was that it exalted imaginative prose almost to the level of the best verse.[1] Poetry had indeed

[1] Saintsbury and Herford, as before. Chambers's *Cyclopædia of English Literature* (4th edition, 2 vols., 1892) gives extracts from prose writers. cf. Craik, *English Prose Writers* (vol. v., 1896). Con-

Development of the novel

often condescended to prose, consciously or unintentionally, but never before had the younger sister (for such we must call her) aspired to fulfil so many of the elder's functions The best Elizabethan prose is heavy-footed though weighty, the best Addisonian mannered and confined It was our Romantic Movement that revealed the full capabilities of prose, vindicated its place in the concert of the Muses. Various causes, various departments, contributed to this result First and foremost comes the renascence of fiction, the writing of which, as we all know, took such a new start within the period we are reviewing Novels of many kinds of course existed before Defoe, Swift, and Sterne—Fielding and Smollett—Richardson—Godwin and his school—Mrs Radcliffe and a host of imitators,—these had familiarised English readers with various forms of tale, and also of whimsical variant. Collections of "British Novelists" were already formed, the word

temporary accounts in Hazlitt's *Spirit of the Age* (3rd edition, 1858), Horne's *New Spirit of the Age* (2 vols, 1844), Leigh Hunt's *Autobiography* (revised edition, 1869), &c., &c De Quincey, Works (16 vols, 1875-80) *passim*. For later criticism, Nassau Senior, *Essays on Fiction* (1864), Bagehot, *Literary Studies* (2 vols, 1879), Leslie Stephen, *Hours in a Library* (3 vols, 1874-79), R H Hutton, *Essays* (2 vols, 1876, now with other volumes in "Eversley Library"), Saintsbury, *Essays in English Literature* (1890), *Corrected Impressions* (1895); Mrs Oliphant, *Victorian Age of English Literature* (2 vols, 1892)

Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage* (10 vols, 1832), comes down only to 1830 Compare Hazlitt, *Book of the Stage*, Leigh Hunt, *Critical Essays on London Performers* Brewer's *Reader's Handbook* (last edition, 1898), Appendix III., gives a list of all plays, with date of performance.

novel was as well known as the word *essay*. Yet the novel as we know it did not exist The old-fashioned "romance", the tale of incident, of which *Gil Blas* is archetype, the novel of character, and that of philosophy, written to point a moral or enforce a creed, the self-conscious narrative, where the author continually stops to sermonise, or moralise, or poke fun at his reader,—these were all familiar forms. To create a new type embodying the best points of all these methods was a task reserved for the Romantic Movement, and Scott was the first who succeeded in this attempt.

Scott's predecessors

As in his poetry, Scott succeeded by transforming old models. The models were there already. To his contemporaries, Scott seemed here too a reviver of old modes, whose genius worked wonders with familiar material We, looking back, can see how essentially original was his departure. But when *Waverley* came out in 1814, this was less apparent. Story-tellers were numerous Fielding, Smollett, and Richardson of course belonged to ancient history But *Evelina* had been published in 1778, *Vathek* in 1787, the *Mysteries of Udolpho* and *Caleb Williams* in 1794, the *Wild Irish Girl* in 1806, the *Scottish Chiefs* in 1810, the *Absentee* in 1812, *Pride and Prejudice* in 1813. The authors of all these were still alive and at work; from all of them Scott took hints, for some he expresses special admiration One form of tale, of which *Udolpho* has been selected as an instance, was especially popular in Scott's day

This was the tale of terror, of which both in prose and verse "Monk" Lewis was a notable exponent, and whose influence can be traced so late as in the writings of Hood and Praed Horace Walpole began this, it was essentially "Gothic" in inspiration, and German examples supplied its acknowledged ideal. Scott in his youth worked for Lewis, was proud to meet him, and retained a lifelong weakness that way His good sense rejected the mere "blood and thunder" element, but whenever he tells of Vehm-gerichts and Templars, Schwarz-reiters and Black Priests of St Paul, we seem to catch something of the old thrill

But Scott invented far more than he borrowed. It is remarkable with how little seeming effort, how spontaneously and suddenly and completely, he perfected his new method. *Waverley* was begun apparently by chance, thrown aside a fragment and wellnigh forgotten, then taken up and finished almost at a heat. *Guy Mannering* succeeded, written simultaneously with the *Lord of the Isles* (1815), while at the same time he was meditating the *Pirate*. The *Antiquary* followed in 1816, *Rob Roy* in 1817, and the "Scotch Novels" were fairly launched, their writer's *modus operandi* established Later developments did little to alter, little even to improve in detail, his conception and handling He grew swifter and surer, hardly more brilliant or more satisfying. In prose as in poetry, Scott was the great *improvisatore* For style he cared little. Niceties and elegancies, epigram and dissection of character, he left mostly to others. He loved to tell a story, and

His own method

his gift for that is peerless But he was more than a story-teller, more even than a writer of "historical novels" This last phrase does not rightly describe the Waverley series, any more than does the other phrase "Scotch novels" Some of the best are neither "historical" nor distinctively Scottish. What Scott does is to introduce us to life, depicting it with unrivalled force and vividness. It may be the life of our own day or another, local or cosmopolitan. In either case he gives us the essential reality of the thing His Scotch peasants are of course as masterly in one way, as his historical scenes and portraits are in another But it is the Shakspearean breadth and clearness of his depictment of life that carries us away captive, it is this, beyond all else, that marks him out the Master

Scott carried the historical novel to perfection at one bound Other writers had groped and struggled, he reached his goal seemingly without exertion His facts may be occasionally perverted, his dates misplaced That belongs to the historian to correct. The general verdict seems to be that his conceptions are astonishingly free from error However this be, his Cavaliers and Puritans, his James VI and Lewis XI., all the crowd of figures which he flung on his canvas with such superb prodigality, strike us as being the men themselves That is the real test. There is no pretence of speaking the language of the time. Costumes and conversations and even incidents are treated with freedom, though Scott's antiquarian instincts kept him from anything

Truth to life

unfinished. We need little wonder, as Lockhart says, that a man who spent half his waking hours in fairy-land, dreaming dreams for our delectation, should have sometimes failed to distinguish fact from fancy in the realms of everyday life. Of other fault Scott stands free And his best lover can scarce regret the stern punishment which fell on him. But for this, we should never have known the greatness of the man. His lately published *Journal*, candid almost beyond compare, and written with no thought of publication, lets us see more fully than ever how nobly he took his trial. Calamity and adversity are the touchstones of character In sorrow, in sickness, in undeserved distress and premature old age, Scott remained heroic and indomitable, cheerful and loving The world is the better for his example and his pain "The glory dies not, and the grief is past."

To dilate on Scott's relation to Romance would be also gratuitous He is himself the arch-romancer.

His relation to Romance

Take any definition of the Romantic Movement, and it will be found embodied in his work. His novels are in prose what Shelley's poems are in verse, the triumph and consummation of the great progress which forms our subject In them its characteristic features, its force and freedom, its love of the Past and contempt for pedantry, its warmth and breadth and passion and humanity, its hatred of strict form and delight in strong colour, are fully exemplified. And with these is a sunny radiance, a genial and unaggressive humour, which is all Scott's own. His tolerant universality is again like Shake-

speare's He mirrors mankind, without partiality or favour For his villains he had a secret fondness, and his heroes proper are apt to be characterless and wooden. But his minor personages make up And the free, healthy tone of all his work stands out in splendid contrast with that of many of his co-workers and successors. Life is seen at its bravest and its best, and the young man who takes the Waverley Novels as his guide to conduct stands small chance of playing cripple or coward in human affairs.

It is less our task to appreciate Scott than to estimate his influence on those who came after And this can scarce be exaggerated, whether we look at home or on the Continent. "Walter Scott" was a name to conjure with through all the nations of Europe. His novels, with Byron's poetry, carried the Romantic seed far and wide. France, Germany, and Italy value him as we do, Germany, in particular, receives her own with interest, and hails a kinsman as well as a leader. This international indebtedness will be noted in subsequent chapters Now it behoves us, before dealing with the successors of Scott, to survey briefly his greatest contemporaries, those too nearly coeval to be moulded by his influence. For, as said before, there were many others working in the same field, there are some whom not even the pre-eminence of Scott can justify us in treating lightly.

His immense influence

England, Ireland, and Scotland each had at this time a woman-writer of independent power in fiction. The "predominant partner," as is not always the case,

claimed the purest genius of the three. Jane Austen (1775-1817) may stand in her place even beside Scott. This young lady—for she died hardly past middle age, and the words come naturally to our lips in thinking of her—had a method and subject of her own, and early became mistress of both. Her six novels were all published between 1811 and 1818. But three of them were written long before *Pride and Prejudice*, *Sense and Sensibility*, and *Northanger Abbey* are said to have been composed in the above order, during 1796-97-98, and the last was certainly offered for publication in 1803. Great novels are seldom written by young authors, and perhaps no such work as these three books was ever executed by a girl of twenty-one to twenty-three years old. The remaining novels belong to the last lustrum of her life, and there is surprisingly little difference in workmanship. Her first book might be deemed her best, if *Emma*, from the second group, did not run it close. But her level of work varies little. Everywhere there is the same keen observation, delicate humour, and finely chiselled though not laborious style. Miss Austen's field was a narrow one, but within it she is supreme. Scott's criticism is well known. "The Big Bow-wow style I can do myself like any now going; but the exquisite touch, which renders . . . commonplace things . . . interesting, . . . is denied me" (*Journal*, March 14, 1826). If too modest, this criticism is in the main sound, and came from one who had read and re-read Miss Austen's work admiringly. Her "talent for describing the involve-

Sister novelists —Miss Austen

ments and feelings and characters of ordinary life" is indeed unique, she has hardly an equal, certainly no superior, in her own line

We have to consider her in relation to the Romantic Movement Her attitude to it was partly antagonistic With its hare-brained sentiment she had no sympathy *Northanger Abbey* is an amusing satire directed against, not our movement, but its precursor in the stories of Mrs Radcliffe. "Sensibility," that pet word of the time, is contrasted by her with homely 'sense" Her youths and maidens are not romantic, even when romance-loving They live in a world essentially Philistine Gossip and fine-sewing are the occupation of her women, with matrimonial efforts as a diversion Her men live useless lives; they hunt or shoot, read and sometimes write, and lecture their female relations. Georgian life in the upper classes was aristocratic in Aristotle's sense; it rested on a Helotry of labourers and manufacturers Miss Austen's heroes never dream of working for a livelihood, unless in the Church or army, they simply subsist on the labour of others. This was doubtless a true picture of her time, though fortunately it seems remote indeed to us—a narrow, and selfish, and unideal existence The revolutionary impulse came to change all this in England. Wider outlook, more generous sympathies, a passion for being and knowing and loving, came in its train. From Miss Austen to Mrs Browning, how great is the step! But the cameo-like pictures of the former, her brush-work on "a little bit of ivory two inches wide" (to

Her attack on ultra-Romanticism

use her own description), remain a joy to the artist and a wonder to the critic. For the vividness of her portraiture is as surprising as the delicacy of the strokes which produce it.

Maria Edgeworth (1767-1849) had a longer life, and a wider field to study. Irish society in all its extremes—wealth and poverty, fun and anger, melancholy and vivacity—lay open before her. She went to Ireland a girl of fifteen, and lived there to old age. Her best books, *Castle Rackrent* (1800), *The Absentee* (1812), and *Ormond* (1817), speak their subject by their titles. She tried other styles, wrote "Moral" and "Popular" Tales and serious volumes, but these three Irish stories are her master-works, and the middle one of the three perhaps best of all. Her, too, Scott admired, and even credited with suggesting his own novels. But, if so, it was only a hint she gave him. Her descriptions are lively, by subject rather than by style, the material rather than the handling amuses us. How fail to be humorous, with such characters to draw? how miss the spring of tears, when contrasted pathos so obtrudes itself? Yet she shows insight and power of selection, and her dialogue is sparkling. Somewhat too obvious her moralising, too designedly didactic, unlike Scott's impersonal narration or Miss Austen's creative aloofness. Her pictures live, after nearly a century of change; and seem still to depict the national character, though laboriously and with frequent exaggeration. Lever is more high-spirited, Carleton more manifestly lifelike, but Ireland may

Miss Edgeworth

still be proud of this daughter, who played no small part in developing the whole modern novel of manners.

Miss Ferrier

Susan Edmonstone Ferrier (1782-1854) was the least important of the three A personal friend of Scott's, she rather shared than was indebted to his inspiration. Her three novels, *Marriage* (1818), *The Inheritance* (1824), and *Destiny* (1831), might so far as dates go belong to Scott's school But dates mislead, as in Miss Austen's case, *Marriage* was on the stocks before *Waverley* appeared, and Miss Ferrier distinctly "drank in her own glass" Her style is lively, but her field narrow. There is more tendency to caricature, less verisimilitude, than with Scott Her plots are little to boast of, she excels rather in dialogue and character-sketches Her Scots gentlewomen of the old school are vividly drawn, if with too free a brush, they stand out from the page as though painted by Wilkie Perhaps, however, her chief value is making a foil to Scott, illustrating the conditions which lay to his hand. Had he been other than he was, his books might have been on the scale of Miss Ferrier's

Other contemporaries

Apart from this trio, it should be remembered that though Fanny Burney (1752-1840), William Godwin (1756-1836), and Mrs Radcliffe (1764-1823) still lived and published, their novels belong to a period quite before ours The two Miss Porters, Jane (1776-1850) and Anna Maria (1780-1832), both wrote on steadily, but never came near the success which had attended the former's *Thaddeus of Warsaw* (1803) and *Scottish Chiefs* (1810)

Mrs Brunton (1778-1818) may be called a more amateur Miss Ferrier, partly anticipating and partly contemporary with Scott Her first novel, *Self-control*, appeared in 1810, *Discipline* (1814), with its Highland pictures, was actually being written when *Waverley* took the world by storm During the rest of her short life she refrained from publication Lady Morgan (1780-1859) did nothing after 1810 so good as the *Wild Irish Girl* (1801) None of these writers, therefore, can be thought of for a moment as competitors with or rivals of Scott

More capable of such emulation, and better entitled than even Scott to be called the father of the "Scottish novel," was John Galt (1779-1839) His racy descriptions of Scots lower-class life, and phonographic accuracy in reproducing its dialect, have never been surpassed The *Ayrshire Legatees* (1820) and *Annals of the Parish* (1821) first revealed his power, the latter is said to have been begun in 1813. To these followed rapidly in the same vein *Sir Andrew Wylie*, *The Entail*, *The Steamboat*, *The Provost*, while *Ringan Gilhaize*, *The Omen*, and others were historical stories of a different class, and decidedly less successful After this he went to Canada on business, and though he lived for ten years after his return produced little of importance. 1821 to 1826 saw his best work done, and the best of it stands very high. It may be doubted if Galt has ever had full justice done him, as the originator of what is now opprobriously called the "Kailyard School." But his significance belongs to "another

Galt

story" than ours It is sufficient here to note him as contemporary with Scott, and, though eight years younger, independent of origin, though later no doubt influenced by his example

Galt left no school, his most notable follower being David Macbeth Moir (1798-1851), poet and prose-writer, the "Delta" of Blackwood's Magazine, in whose pages appeared *Mansie Wauch* (completed in book form, 1828), Moir's best work, and worthy of Galt Otherwise the novel of provincialism and dialect was for long little worked. Scott had started the historical novel on new lines, and fashion followed his lead Yet it was curiously long before any worthy successor appeared It seems as if the completeness of his success daunted rivalry Avowed imitations, and even suppositious Waverley novels, were not wanting, of interest only to the curious student But direct descendant, rightful heir of Scott's throne, there came none. It was different abroad. Dumas and Victor Hugo and Manzoni take up Scott's inheritance, wield his magic wand with original strength. At home, English literature was in the dulness of a transition period, in prose fiction as in verse Some names, however, deserve passing note

Immediate followers

Horace Smith, Morier, Peacock, Hook, Michael Scott, and Marryat were all slightly junior to Galt. They developed the novel sometimes on independent lines, more often with specialism only of place and circumstance. Hook's lively but now scarcely readable volumes gave more hints than is commonly

acknowledged to both Dickens and Thackeray. Morier's *Hajji Baba* (1824), Scott's *Tom Cringle's Log* (1829-33), and the best of Marryat's stories—such as *Peter Simple* (1833) and *Midshipman Easy* (1834)—are classics in their way, and to Marryat in particular belongs the credit of making sea-life real, a task only essayed before in some sketches by Smollett Peacock cultivated a field of his own The four early novels—*Headlong Hall* (1816), *Nightmare Abbey* (1818), *Maid Marian* (1822), and *Crotchet Castle* (1831),[1]—with the much later *Gryll Grange* (1860), constitute a *genre* of their own, but had little effect on the literary current of his time Side by side with these, Lady Blessington and Mrs Gore wrote "society novels" of limited scope, and Charles Robert Maturin continued the "tale of terror," of which Mrs Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1816), however, forms a more striking if solitary example. The mine of Irish story was worked energetically by Crofton Croker, Banim, Carleton, and Lover, developing on tolerably similar lines Miss Edgeworth's original suggestion. And *The Subaltern* (1825) of George Robert Gleig, a tale of the Peninsular War, is noteworthy as an early instance of the novel of military adventure

Influences other than fiction

All the writers that have been named hitherto were born in the Eighteenth Century. Their intellectual growth was therefore to some extent synchronous with the movement which forms our subject It is different with the next generation

[1] *Melincourt* (1817) and *The Misfortunes of Elphin* (1829) stand somewhat apart from these.

Taking the year 1825 as the earliest date by which a writer born in the present Century could have attained full development, it is clear that he or she came to maturity in a world where the Romantic Triumph was already fully achieved To such it was no longer a revolutionary movement but an accepted creed; questioning and reaction naturally followed. Before, therefore, going on to the great names that come later, it may be well to ask what other influences, outside of pure fiction, went to the completing of this triumph, and to the perfecting of English prose However mighty and far-reaching Scott's work, it did not stand by any means alone In pure fiction he was master, but in mixed letters other remarkable forces combined to operate

Journals

With journalism proper we have only limited concern Yet it should be remembered that Coleridge, Campbell, and others worked for newspapers, as Southey for magazines Literature began to invade the news-letter. A development which has only culminated in recent days—if it have indeed reached its climax—was already making its humble start. But it is to the monthly magazine rather than the daily newspaper that we must look for literary inspiration during this period. The older magazines had been mere reviews. Even early numbers of the *Edinburgh Review* (founded 1802) and *Quarterly Review* (1809) were but faintly superior to the *Monthly Magazine* and *Critical Review* of older days. It is not till *Blackwood's Magazine* made its

second and final start in October 1817, that we find anything like what we now expect in magazines, articles of distinct and original literary importance, along with the mere useful summary or critical examination of other writers' work

The magazine proper

The history of "Maga" has been recently written at full length by a writer to whom the task was a labour of love. We need not follow her through the details of her story. Magazines like "Blackwood's" and the rivals which followed — of which the *London Magazine* almost simultaneously, and *Fraser's Magazine* some dozen years later, were the most important[1]—are practically a development of the old Essay. The essay or pamphlet is a form of publication boasting a long and honourable existence in Great Britain It was a happy thought to stitch several together, and issue them in monthly form This gave time for real literary work, and secured wider variety and more adequate space than was possible in the *Spectators, Idlers, Ramblers,* and *Tatlers* of a former age.

Its literary value

The merely critical side of the new magazines we need not dwell on. Jeffrey, and Brougham, and Macaulay, and Sydney Smith, and Cobbett, and Lockhart, and Wilson,—so far as these only wrote slashing reviews, they may be left aside No doubt their critical performances too were a factor in

[1] Among other magazines and reviews were — *Colburn's New Monthly, John Bull, The Age, The Satirist, The Metropolitan, Westminster Review, Eclectic Review, Examiner, Athenæum,* &c., &c. Cf. p. 126

the growth of the age, and it is interesting to see how their canons widened. But criticism *per se* is not literature In the reprinted volumes of Francis, Lord Jeffrey (1773-1850), for example, it may be doubted if there is a single paper of permanent consequence He was critic and arbiter of letters, and posterity will not forget his name, or his figure as sketched not ungently by Carlyle in his *Reminiscences*. The band of clever young men who started the "Edinburgh" live as historical figures, not as literary workers Gifford, first editor of the "Quarterly," has been previously mentioned as a poet, as poet and satirist he is remembered, as critic he is but a name And for some time older writers, the "hacks" of periodical writing, largely pervaded the new magazines Gradually, however, new blood prevailed, new methods appeared. A race of penmen, who for pecuniary or other reasons preferred inditing magazine articles to the labour of writing books, grew up and developed styles of their own Some of the most characteristic work of the time was done under these novel conditions, and done in a way that left permanent traces on our literature The names of the most accomplished writers of "occasional articles," whose style and methods did so much to develop English prose, must be briefly recalled.

Charles Lamb

First comes the ever delightful Charles Lamb (1775-1834) His "Essays of Elia" were contributed, from 1820 onward, to the *London Magazine* Before this Lamb had written on Hogarth and Shakespeare in Leigh Hunt's short-lived *Reflector*,

besides publishing tales and tragedies, which might claim place for him as a novelist But the Essays are his best work Small need to discuss these, familiar as they are to readers of all tastes and ages The point to bring out is, that here was high-class original work appearing with other papers in a magazine, and only afterwards gathered into a book Before this Century, one cannot recall any case quite parallel[1] And the writer of this work, so mellow, so tender, so full of charm—sprightly or pathetic, but in all moods delightful—as he was himself one of the finest "wits" of his day, so he cannot but have deeply impressed the young minds that were coming to maturity during the 'Twenties of our Century.

Southey

Another giant of the magazines was the poet Southey. His contributions to the *Quarterly Review* alone would fill volumes And his prose style has great merit Without the charm of Lamb — without indeed the "vaporous drop" of genius, whose absence is the one fatal flaw in all Southey's work — it has clearness, manliness, and variety. The conditions under which he wrote almost precluded sovereign excellence All his writing is hack-work, but the best of its kind. A word may be said later about his historical essays. At present we are concerned only to note him as one of the leaders in popularising knowledge by high-class magazine articles, and by miscellaneous writing of the kind represented best in his hodge-podge book-series *The*

[1] Unless Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* be the exception which proves the rule.

Doctor (1834–47), and in many pleasant pages of the *Life and Correspondence* (1850) issued by the filial zeal of his second son Cuthbert

Cobbett

Some years older than these, and very different as a writer, was William Cobbett (1762-1835) A chequered life gave him strangely varied experiences He had been ploughman and soldier, attorney's clerk, tutor, and pamphleteer (the last in America, where he spent the last seven years of the century), before in 1802 he started his *Weekly Register*. This was a journal of politics, not of literature. But it caused in political writing a Wordsworthian change toward directness and simplicity The old kid-glove and full-dress style of controversy was exchanged for English which is racy if often vulgar, and has a hit like a kicking horse Nothing like Cobbett's invective had been heard since Swift. To equal him with Swift would be absurd, so far as literary shape goes; but in sheer force he will bear comparison Of his numerous books, *Rural Rides* (1830) at least is a classic. The *English Grammar* (1810), *Advice to Young Men* (1830), and the bitterly one-sided *History of the English Reformation* (1824-27) are best known of the remainder But he wrote hosts of other things, all in the same nervous, sinewy English. *Rural Rides* is itself a reprint from the *Register*, other selections from which fill six more volumes. *Porcupine's Works*, a reprint of his American writings (signed "Peter Porcupine"), fill double that number. Cobbett farmed and wrote, made money and lost it, went for two more years to America, returned to be tried for

sedition and get into Parliament Through all this the *Register* went on, doing much to develop journalism, much also to accustom men to a racier, quainter, more plain and idiomatic style than the dignity of letters had lately allowed He was a power and a terror, and stamped his impression deep on the minds both of friends and opponents, and indeed in a sense on English literature generally

Sydney Smith (1771-1845), the wittiest of Englishmen, irresistibly genial yet of solid good sense, parson, Edinburgh Reviewer, and author of *Plymley's Letters* (1808), may serve to separate Cobbett from another strong writer and zealous hater, William Hazlitt (1778 - 1830) Younger than the other two just named, Hazlitt was also more literary, more deeply touched by the new methods and ideals. Personal acquaintance with Coleridge powerfully affected him in early manhood, and he devoted himself to literature and art, but as expositor rather than originator His early philosophical and political writings, his latest *Life of Napoleon* (1828), have no abiding value But as critic and critical exponent his place is among the very first *The Spirit of the Age* (1825) is his best-known book, the description of Coleridge preaching, in *My First Acquaintance with Poets*,[1] his best-known short passage. From 1812 to 1830 he poured forth a flood of critical and miscellaneous essays, unequalled in quality by any writer of his time. Lamb is more ethereal, more delicately subtle, claims more unmistakably the prerogatives of genius, Cobbett excels

Hazlitt

[1] *The Liberal*, No. III (1823)

in sledge-hammer force. Hazlitt, more practical than Lamb, more refined than Cobbett, surpasses both as a direct critic He, too, was a journalist. The *Examiner* and *Morning Chronicle*, the *Edinburgh Review* and *London Magazine*, printed much of his best work. He lectured, also—as did Coleridge and others—upon various classes of English poets His permanent fame rests on his essays and critical sketches, which one is glad to find still reprinted in cheap form. For, with all Hazlitt's faults—his violence, his prejudice, his bitter temper and want of reticence about himself and others—he stands and will stand in the very first class of philosopher-critics of our own literature, narrowed only by comparative ignorance of literatures other than our own.

De Quincey

Thomas de Quincey (1785-1859) is yet another writer in periodicals whose work had great and influential literary value. Settled first at Grasmere, then in Edinburgh—if *settled* be the word to describe his elvish and erratic ways—he supported himself and his family by incessant magazine work *Confessions of an Opium-eater*, in the *London Magazine* for 1821, brought him first into fame For the rest of life his income was assured, so long as he could ply pen And ply it he did, amid all the self-created hindrances of an unpractical temperament, always late with "copy," pursued by printers' devils, dodging imaginary creditors, turning night into day and day into night. Maugre such troubles, he produced a large volume of work, sometimes worthless, generally valuable in parts, always readable

by those who can tolerate his style On *style* De Quincey prided himself, as stylist he wished to and did make his mark. And at its best his prose poetry reaches highest excellence There are passages in the *Opium-eater* which no reader can forget, which might serve as typical instances of the change that was coming over English prose. And such passages occur elsewhere continually, without notice or preparation. In a casual essay on "Sir William Hamilton" (Works, vol. xvi), we are suddenly plunged into that well-known, ambitiously successful bit of *bravura* beginning "Martyrdom it is, and no less" De Quincey was a student of German, in a profounder sense than Scott and Wordsworth. And while the prime inspiration of such passages is Elizabethan English, we cannot fail to realise how deeply the Teutonic dye had tinged his being As a rule, however, and in ordinary writing, De Quincey's style "overleaps the selle" Its incessant artifice, irrepressible self-consciousness, the tortuousness and complacency of its interminable involutions, its effort and whimsy and air of a juggler performing his feat, soon pall on most readers To us who did not know the little wizened elaborately-courteous man, with his childish self-deceptions and lovable abnormalities, the style which was himself seems affected and wearisome. In his own day, however, De Quincey was both a type and a model, and must be seriously reckoned with in treating the evolution of English prose.

Next come the lions of "Blackwood," John

Wilson (1785-1854) and his younger friend John Gibson Lockhart (1794-1854). "Christopher North," the elder of the pair, was the very impersonation of the "magazine man" we have in view His separate works go for little, neither his poems (mentioned before), nor his *Lights and Shadows of Scottish Life* (1822) and *Margaret Lyndsay* 1823), can be credited with much individuality But in "Maga" he was a force indeed Tastes change, and the revelry of *Noctes Ambrosianæ* disgusts a dyspeptic generation. Their high jinks and high talk, their guzzlings and gambols, their pretentiousness and prejudice and contempt of Cockneys and Whigs, all seem to us equally tiresome Only the immortal *Shepherd* survives his wrecked surroundings. And of this noble image Wilson was chief originator. Through its lips he poured the very best of his own thought, which otherwise meanders through rather long-winded and slovenly papers, written against time, and bearing too clear marks of their origin Yet, with all faults, Wilson's *Blackwood* work shows the prodigality of genius Want of form will probably prevent it ever coming back into favour His ascendancy must have been largely a personal matter The great, genial, glorious 'Professor," with his magnificent bodily frame, and reputation for unequalled pedestrian and pugilistic prowess, for supremacy of muscle as of mind, took men's admiration by storm. If he did no really great work as either poet, philosopher, or critic, he combined all three into one figure of heroic proportions, whose sayings and doings in

John Wilson

Blackwood were events of prime importance in their day

His ally Lockhart, younger and more scholarly, gave himself up mainly to magazine work. In *Blackwood*, and later as editor of the *Quarterly*, he did yeoman service for the light-horse brigade, his sharp satire, and indeed occasional scurrility, sometimes getting him into trouble. But he found time also for independent writing His *Spanish Ballads* (1823) have more vitality than all Wilson's verse, he wrote four novels — *Valerius* (1821), *Adam Blair* (1822), *Reginald Dalton* (1823), and *Matthew Wald* (1824)—the first and second of which at any rate were favourably received, and, besides short lives of Burns and Napoleon, he secured immortality by his *Life of Scott* (1837-8) This admirably executed work is at least the second in rank of great biographies, and there are good judges who doubt if even Boswell's *Johnson* can be put before it. In his periodical writing, Lockhart displays the same fighting qualities which distinguish *Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk* (1819) Caustic wit, satire which earned his name of *Scorpion*, and keen observation are applied to letters in general, as in that book to Edinburgh society. Wilson and Lockhart, with their following, did much to revolutionise the tone of criticism, and to introduce a heartier and healthier, if not as yet a more kindly and sympathetic, view of life and literature.

John Gibson Lockhart

It were wearisome to enumerate the lesser lights who sparkled in the pages of "Maga" and her successors. Maginn (brilliant free-lance) and Macnish and

Moir, Gleig and Warren, Barham and Miss Martineau, Edward Irving, Count D'Orsay, and a host of others, need not be individualised in regard of their contributions to journalism As a collective body of magazinists, their work was to supple, and variegate, and widen the scope of our prose essay or article, to familiarise the public with it as a medium through which any subject, from metaphysics to prize-fighting, might be suitably discussed That work they did well and thoroughly. Hence proceeds the Magazine of to-day, with its width of subject, adequacy of treatment, elevation of literary tone That the result has its drawbacks, need not be concealed. Our books incline to become bundles of reprints, our authors find it easier to write articles than volumes. Knowledge has been popularised, and has also perhaps been in some measure plebified But few would deny that the upshot on the whole has been good, and at any rate it has been a change of conspicuous importance, reacting powerfully on all forms of our literature.

The Blackwood school

Closely connected with the Magazines came also much independent work of the 'occasional" kind. The writings of John Wilson Croker belong to this class, as do those of Miss Mitford, William and Mary Howitt, Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe, and many others. Dunlop's *History of Fiction* (1814) may perhaps find place in this connection, and William Jerdan's *Literary Gazette* (founded 1817) Space forbids multiplication of ex-

Varieties

amples under this head, nor allows us to linger over that other form of literary enterprise denoted by the names *Album*, *Amulet*, *Keepsake*, and the like These were compilations, as a rule handsomely got up and profusely illustrated, containing contributions in prose and verse from authors of all degrees of eminence. Such Christmas Books, as we may call them, often constituted an "editor's benefit," got up to reward some struggling man of letters, whose powerful friends took this pleasant way of aiding with money's worth in the shape of brains But the fashion died soon, and these pretty volumes are not scarce enough to be worth buying, while the best of their contents is available in more convenient form.

Travel literature

Writers on travel of this period may be grouped together, without exactitude of dates Interest in foreign countries was a feature of the age, and travellers were still scholars Clarke, Forsyth, Hobhouse (Byron's "classic Hobhouse"), and Colonel Leake were the chief authorities on Italy and Greece. Sir John Barrow, Sir John Malcolm, and Sir Robert Ker Porter—all knighted for services abroad —published weighty works on Asiatic and African countries, while Sir John Bowring added translation to travel, and studied popular folk-songs. Ross, Parry, and Scoresby thrilled their readers with tales of Arctic adventure; Mungo Park, dead some years before, lived again in his posthumously published *Second Voyage* A striking figure of the day was Belzoni, whose *Excavations in Egypt* (1821) proved the rage for a time.

Charles Waterton deserves mention for his *Wanderings in South America* (1828), Captain Basil Hall for books of travel from 1818 onward, his last work, *Fragments of Voyages and Travels* (1830-40), being a classic of exploration

The drama—tragedy

One extensive department remains to take into account. Serious tragedy has been noticed occasionally in former pages The drama stands midway between poetry and prose fiction, and in its lighter forms approximates closely to the latter, the dialogue of comedy being indistinguishable from that of the novel The whole drama of our period may advantageously be treated in a parenthesis, its place in the literature under review being itself parenthetical. Striking is the contrast with that other literary revival under Elizabeth, when drama was the chosen form, the principal vehicle employed. In our period it is little more than a survival, the novel takes its place as the universal medium Tragedy was still an object of respect. Coleridge and Wordsworth, Byron and Shelley, Scott, Lamb, and others, all tried their hands at it But even they rather from imitation than inspiration, and they founded no school If anything, they started a tendency, which soon became strong, to substitute for drama the dramatic poem. This tendency, traceable back to Goethe's *Faust* as initiator and model, took the best writers of next generation away from drama. Bailey's *Festus*, Horne's *Orion*, Sydney Dobell and Alexander Smith, are cases in point, while the most important and profitable of

all is Browning. Instead of his earlier tragedies we get *Men and Women*; instead of a conventional drama, the dramatic monologue. Of writers who were faithful to tragedy proper, most have been already named. Talfourd and Milman and Sir Henry Taylor, Joanna Baillie and Miss Mitford, are the salient names after those of the great poets. To these we may now add Richard Lalor Shiel (1791-1851), the Irish politician, who wrote a series of plays mostly between 1815 and 1825, while the *Bertram* of Charles Maturin (*ante*, p. 88) was a nine days' wonder in 1816. No other conspicuous name occurs in serious play-writing, till we come to *Richelieu* and *The Lady of Lyons* (both 1838), by an author whose work we shall soon have to survey. Practically, it will be admitted, serious tragedy is but a by-play of this era, its highest energies did not express themselves in this form.

Comedy

Comedy and farce are more abundant. Sheridan died in 1816, and though the younger Colman lived till 1836, his *Mynheer van Dunck* and other pieces belong to earlier days. Thomas Morton (1764-1838), two years junior to Colman both in birth and death, author of *Speed the Plough*, was also a veteran or *emeritus*. But of younger writers there was no lack. The difficulty is to find anything that can fairly be called literature, classified alongside of such work as *Rejected Addresses*. Hook's one or two plays hardly deserve that name. The *Paul Pry* (1816) of John Poole (1786-1872) has at least given us one proverbial

character. Reynolds and Coyne and W T "Moncrieff," and even J. R Planché,—these names hardly live outside the greenroom door Perhaps John Baldwin Buckstone (1802-79) and Douglas William Jerrold (1803-57) come nearest our ideal, the former's best hit being with *Green Bushes* (1845), as the latter's with *Black-eyed Susan* (1829) Jerrold did better work than this, though mostly of a fugitive and journalistic order, more amusing than important But in comedy these, with the *Box and Cox* (1847) of J M Morton (1811-91), seem the best of a poor bunch Just before 1850, a group of younger writers comes forward, but the work of Shirley Brookes, Tom Taylor, Dion Boucicault, Blanchard Jerrold, W. G. Wills, Tom Robertson, and H J Byron, is best left to be dealt with in the concluding volume of this series, even though one or two plays (like Boucicault's *London Assurance*) come well within our time For the rest, information about the stage of this date will be found in the lives of Kean and the Kembles, Macready, C. M Young, and others, not forgetting Charles Mathews (1776-1835), whose *At Home* (about 1818) may fairly be ranked as comedy, and has shown the way to various more or less similar "entertainments" since

Carlyle

We have now perhaps exhausted the minor forms of light literature, which along with the novel made up the belles lettres of the 'Twenties, and are almost ready to take up the record of fiction-writing at the point where it broke off One

name, however, of outstanding importance remains yet to mention, whose chronological fitness in this page may create surprise Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), though belonging so much to our own days, dates from the Eighteenth Century as to birth, and was older than many writers whom we think of as wholly Georgian This should perhaps be remembered when we read his criticism of Scott and others. The Waverley Novels were not part of his boyish education, they came out when he was already reaching early manhood And as he himself was a leader in the reaction which followed their success, we need hardly expect dispassionate or "detached" criticism from him. Carlyle flowered late, therefore many younger writers preceded him in popularity. But he strikes his roots back beyond them into an earlier generation, and shows signs of this to an attentive reader. Carlyle had much of the Scottish peasant in him, much of the stern *dourness* we ascribe to that character, something of its narrowness as well as force But of course he represents a later view of life than Burns or Hogg, was far better educated, and rose permanently above both in station Of genius he had his full share. Mastery of verse-rhythm was denied him, and characteristically he inveighs against it as archaism and folly. Prose is his medium, but he strives hard to make it fulfil the functions of poetry. In doing so, he invents a style of his own. Wilful and rebellious, he spurns all fetters of precedent and grammar. What are helps to other men are hindrances to him. The English language is not ex-

pressive enough, he must create a tongue for himself Unrivalled descriptive power, the gift of depicting personality by an epithet, and scenes as if with an instantaneous camera — this was perhaps Carlyle's master-endowment To this all else gives way, in history as in essay-writing. Carlyle notably represents the serious study of German, mainly on its literary side, as Coleridge and De Quincey on its speculative He imported German idiom into his speech, as well as German habit into his thought. How far-reaching his influence has been, every page of modern writing shows

Carlyle began as an Edinburgh Reviewer, with articles which bear little trace of his later mannerism

Lateness of development Even earlier indeed he had written papers for Brewster's *Encyclopædia*, but his literary importance begins with his *Life of Schiller* (1825), *German Romance* (1826) and Review article on *Richter* (1827) During his retirement at Craigenputtock he wrote mainly for the magazines, and in Fraser's Magazine for 1833-34 appeared his first independent original work, the famous *Sartor Resartus* Removing to London in 1834, he remained permanently there, writing and lecturing and during the next fifteen years published the *French Revolution* (1837), *Past and Present* (1843), and *Cromwell* (1845), besides other miscellaneous work Beyond this point we do not follow him. He is of immense importance in the prose literature of 1830-50, a revolutionary force, tearing convention in tatters, and bursting all remaining bonds alike of literary form and speculative

postulate How far his work was beneficial, we need not at present stay to enquire Our concern is to realise that he was synchronous with the novelists we are about to mention, older than most of them, but contemporary as to dates of publication As a stylist he stands apart by himself. Many of us resent as strongly as possible the liberties he took with his mother-tongue, say rather the violence with which he wrenched and twisted and distorted into uncouth shape her sanctities of speech But none can refuse to see in Carlyle a force of the first order, an influence to which we owe much that is most abiding in our conceptions of life and thought and literature.

Novel resumed

Coming back now at last to the main current of novel-writing, we first encounter two writers who may be shortly dismissed as pale shadows of Scott. George Payne Rainsford James (1801-60) and William Harrison Ainsworth (1805-82) during many years competed for the favour of young or easily satisfied readers, and it is hard to say which obtained most of it Perhaps *Jack Sheppard* (1839), *Old St Paul's* (1841), *Windsor Castle* (1843), and others by Ainsworth, had a wider popularity than anything by his rival. James, however, if less exciting, is usually the pleasanter writer; both novelists still preserve some remains of their old vogue

More interesting problems, and a wider range, meet us in Edward Bulwer, first Lord Lytton (1803-73) Bulwer, or Bulwer Lytton, as his contemporaries

variously knew him, was one of the most accomplished writers of his day. We have seen that he wrote poetry, not of the first rank, and plays—*Richelieu*, *Money*, and the *Lady of Lyons*—which, coming out in 1838-40, still hold the stage. But his chief work was prose fiction. He once said that in all he attempted he began by failure, and victory only followed perseverance. Early poems fell flat, an early play is quite forgotten, and his first novel, *Falkland* (1827), had not much success. But *Pelham* (1828) commanded attention, and was followed in rapid succession by *The Disowned* and *Devereux*, *Paul Clifford*, *Eugene Aram*, *Godolphin*, *Pilgrims of the Rhine*, the *Last Days of Pompeii*, and *Rienzi*, all within the next seven years. *Alice* (1837) and *Leila* (1838) appeared along with his plays, which again were followed by *Night and Morning* (1841), the weird *Zanoni* (1842), *Harold*, and the *Last of the Barons* (1843). Then he turned back to poetry, but *Lucretia* (1846) came between the *New Timon* and *King Arthur*. In 1850 he broke fresh ground with the *Caxtons* series, just as much later with *Kenelm Chillingly* and the *Parisians*. Into these later achievements we must not follow him. The long list of his Romantic novels speaks for itself. When we remember that besides being novelist, poet, and dramatist he was a busy magazine-contributor, edited for some years the *New Monthly*, and from 1831 to 1841 sat in Parliament, some idea may be formed of his remarkable diligence and versatility.

Bulwer Lytton

In truth, Bulwer Lytton had great gifts. He read

widely, thought actively, and had no mean pictorial faculty. Yet the unreality of his novels prevents their reaching front rank. His characters do not live they are puppets skilfully constructed, moving as their maker directs Art supplants nature We find in Bulwer that "neo-Romantic" spirit which appeared also in poetry Inspiration is no longer spontaneous but laboured, and eked out by the resources of learning Add that Bulwer's own taste confused the grandiose with the great Simplicity was alien to him, symbolism and mystery congenial He worships the Beautiful with a big *B*, and is ready to prostrate himself before any Cabbalistic mummery Abstractions of all sorts appeal to him, he cares less for the thought than for the garment in which it is disguised. From Germany he learned mysticism, sentimental melancholy, cloudy reverie, and delight in abstract phrases But his sentiment is not all unreal, his abstractions have still a concrete background He knows what he writes about, though he loves posing and grandiloquence, and never allows us to lose himself in his characters. Real strength underlies his little fopperies and sentimentalism Exaggerated and inflated, his Romanticism provoked criticism and parody, the latter finding meet prey in his sonorous but hollow periods. Yet, after all deduction, Bulwer had certainly high talent, and has left much good work, though none which might not easily have been better Versatile and prolific, he lacked concentration and rigorous pruning. He is a sort of masculine Mrs Hemans, with her fatal

Faults and merits

fluency and love of cheap sentiment He helped to debase the Romantic ideal, to substitute silver for gold, not to mention indubitable pinchbeck Therefore he fairly lay open to the satirist and the scorner, and the writer we are next to mention was not slow to take advantage of such opportunity.

Thackeray

William Makepeace Thackeray (1811-63) was the very antipodes of Bulwer Of pretence in any form he was sworn foe, any approach to sham stirred his sharpest satire. Born in India, but educated in England, his first taste was for pictorial art, and only loss of fortune compelled him to write. Newspapers and magazines gave him plentiful employment, and a needlessly large quantity of these early articles has been reprinted in his Works The *Paris Sketchbook* (1840) was his first separate production, followed up rapidly by the *Yellowplush Papers*, *Hoggarty Diamond*, and *Shabby Genteel Story* *Barry Lyndon* (1842) first showed his real power, while in *Vanity Fair* (1847-8) and *Pendennis* (1849-50) he may be said to have reached his full stature as a novelist. We leave him at this point His later novels, his attempt to get into Parliament, his brief editorship of the *Cornhill Magazine*, are all beyond our province. But in this earlier work, largely reprinted from magazines and particularly from *Punch*, still more in *Vanity Fair* and *Pendennis*, there is enough to demand very special attention in this book.

Thackeray was at once Romantic and anti-Romantic.

He satirised scathingly the sham-antique school of fiction, with its castles and knights and troubadours and portcullises, all theatrical and devoid of reality. But his own sentiment is Romantic at heart, and by no means free from a leaning to sentimentalism. His satire is the indignation of one who would fain be benevolent The neo-Romantic tendency with him turned to criticism rather than ornamentation, but it is there all the same. Bulwer and Thackeray are the chief embodiments of this tendency in fiction, from very different standpoints and with very different results Bulwer's methods were anathema to Thackeray. Their veneer, glitter, and tinsel he could not endure, and in *Novels by Eminent Hands* he gives first place to a burlesque of their grosser inanities Bulwer is essentially Byronic, Thackeray anti-Byronic. Yet they have more in common than appears at first. The shield is the same, though looked at on reverse sides Certainly Thackeray's manly, direct, straightforward portraiture is far above Bulwer's posturing and rhodomontade. His characters are men and women, not masks or dummies To hear him talk, you would think him modern of the moderns History is to put off pumps and periwig, and foot it among common mortals; poetry is to veil itself in the garb of common speech. Yet the sentimentalising, poetising, moralising turn is never far off, life is not looked on for itself, but for the lessons it conveys Thackeray's manners and morals are already old-fashioned, we read his novels with delight, but

His attitude to Romance

they represent a world other than ours His characters move on a stage of their own Jos Sedley and Becky Sharp are real enough, as well as immortal, but they are seen as through coloured glasses, and the personality of their author goes for much in their presentation to us.

Charm of manner

That personality was indeed always delightful. Thackeray is as pleasant as Montaigne, but we never forget his presence. He talks to us as a friend, and one of his chief charms is the unstudied grace of his conversation His style in its way is simply perfect. Without effort, without the least display, he gives you of his best, grave or gay, sparkling or pathetic Thackeray was not exactly a "writing man" When he began a novel, it was from necessity more than choice, and he is afraid it may bore you as it somewhat does him. Incident he does not trouble about the story, even the characters, are left pretty much to shape themselves But the bright and kindly narrator is always at your elbow with him as guide, small chance that the way will prove wearisome. Thackeray's art of companionship is perhaps his highest accomplishment, the style in which his narration, exposition, and comment are couched is a perennial joy in itself, and as modern as his habit of thought is old-world and artificial.

Thackeray had great influence, both in matter and manner No modern novelist is unaffected by his priority Even in small details, he set the fashion, nor only to writers of books. The loud, noisy man,

whose scorn of sham makes him shout, and brawl, and contradict unceasingly, is studied much from Thackeray's heroes, especially the intolerable Philip of a later novel. And in literature as in life Thackeray's mastership goes deep. He and Carlyle have taught us to be intolerant of humbug. The lesson has been pushed farther than they foresaw, what was truth to them has been analysed with unsparing, sometimes presumptuous, rigour. The Holy of Holies of life itself has been stripped of what seemed illusory trappings. Whether human frailty may not sometimes have taken the real for sham, the essential for the adventitious, is another matter, but the influence of Thackeray has been supreme with later novelists, and on the whole it has assuredly been an influence for good.

Influence and teaching.

Thackeray's great contemporary rival was Charles Dickens (1812-70). Dickens is of special interest to us, because he stands so much apart from the current of his age. In any era, his qualities would have probably showed the same. True, his pathos recalls the ultra-sentimentalism of the Romantics, no one escapes his time, and possibly this is an inheritance from his immediate precursors. But at any rate it is the real Dickens. In pathos as in fun, he is the same quickly responding, easily exaggerating nature, too emotional to comprehend the satiety produced on readers by his laboured sentiment as by the stereotyped catchwords denoting his comic characters. Both are so real to himself, so part and

Dickens

parcel of his conception. This is the defect of his quality, no doubt, but how keen and pure and joyous is that quality! Comedy of the finest, perfect in itself, and provoking a chorus of irresistible laughter. Dress and *milieu* are after all secondary to this, those who "cannot read Dickens" are repelled by mere mechanical deficiencies of presentment, and fail to pierce through these to the informing reality. Powers which in another age would have made a Congreve or even a Molière were diverted in Dickens to the service of the novel.

His upbringing and popularity

A Londoner at heart, Dickens was fortunate in seeing London life thoroughly. Portsmouth and Chatham claimed a few early years, but when his father's reverses threw the family on the world, they were already in London The blacking factory at Hungerford Market, the visits to Marshalsea, Camden Town and the school in Hampstead Road, the solicitor's office and the reporter's notebook, all were training for Dickens It was a rough education, painful too at times, but incomparably useful From 1833 onward Dickens wrote much for the magazines. This and his reporter's work caused frequent country expeditions, also turned later to capital account. *Sketches by Boz* (in book form, 1836) was his first literary venture, but later in the same year he married and began *Pickwick*. From that time his literary career was a succession of triumphs *Oliver Twist*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, the *Old Curiosity Shop*, *Barnaby Rudge*, *American Notes*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, the *Christmas Tales*, *Pictures from*

Italy, *Dombey and Son*, and *David Copperfield*, followed in this order, and in continuous succession, between 1838 and 1850, where we properly leave him. His later work broke little fresh ground, except partially in the *Tale of Two Cities*. But his popularity never flagged, and he worked untiringly, not only at novels, but at multifarious other matters, editing *Household Words*, lecturing and giving readings, indulging his love of the stage in private though he curiously never wrote a play—to the end one of the busiest of men, and one of the heartiest of friends to those who knew him Some books might take less well than others, but he never had cause to dread losing his public, and died as he had lived, the most welcome and widely read author of his day

Relation to Thackeray

It is curious to remember that Thackeray sought the work of illustrating *Pickwick* One year his junior, Dickens preceded him as a writer, nor did Thackeray's vogue ever equal his rival's. Both adopted a plan which was popular at the time, but had its danger to lazy writers, of issuing their novels in monthly numbers Thackeray's work rather suffered by this piecemeal publication, the energetic nature of Dickens found no similar temptation But in any case his reading circle was wider than Thackeray's, extending indeed over the English-speaking world. The green-covered numbers went far and wide, were read by American camp-fires and in Australian bush. Stalwart miners sympathised with David Copperfield, and dissolved in tears over the death of Little Nell Something of emulation is

visible in Thackeray's references to his rival, but jealousy could not exist in that noble nature. He frankly admires, though he cannot but compare, and thinks his own "yellow" number too deserves the praise it gets A mere misunderstanding separated them for a time, but they were friends again before the end Never very close friends, it is pleasant to know that they were fairly intimate, for their names will go down to posterity inseparably linked as the pair of leading writers, the foremost novelists of their time.

Thackeray had influence, but Dickens founded a school Young writers worked under him, and easily caught his mannerisms, the tricks of his trade These mannerisms grew on him latterly. The *leit-motifs* previously alluded to, the habit of associating a gesture or physical peculiarity with each character, hardened into caricature. But he had far more than this to teach his followers Careful attention to plot, photographic minuteness and accuracy of detail, genial flow of narration, unmarred by obtrusion of the writer's personality, above all, the creation of bold and strongly marked types of character—these are some points in his method. It is said his types are unreal We do not meet such characters in society, but, as with Turner's sunsets, don't we wish we could! A world in which Sam Weller, Sairey Gamp, Dick Swiveller, Mr Micawber, Captain Cuttle, and Mark Tapley—to name but a few—could be encountered, would be a world worth dwelling in. They are more living than real life, more actual than

Method and mannerisms

action itself Imagination transcends reality Imagination, indeed, was this writer's crowning gift No other English novelist, not Scott himself, equals him here. We can forget all minor faults, all crudeness and vulgarity and over-ambitious style and restriction to one class of subject, for the sake of this splendid endowment. A jester like Hood, Dickens was also master of an imagination which outstripped and outsoared reality; and the exercise of this gift places him next after Scott among the brilliant novelists of the Century in our land.

Bulwer and Thackeray represented the over-ripeness of the Romantic school, one by his bombast, the other by his mockery; Dickens stood apart by himself A fourth novelist may be named even beside Dickens and Thackeray. Benjamin Disraeli, afterwards Lord Beaconsfield (1804-81), was somewhat older than either, but his best work came late. Born of a father, Isaac D'Israeli (1766-1848), who should himself be mentioned in this chapter as a writer of agreeable literary miscellanies, the younger Disraeli was a man of letters from the first, and some would say to the end With his career as statesman we have no concern, his politics interest only as reflected in his books. It is not unfair to say that, both in life and letters, young Disraeli was resolved to startle. His one aim was to get to the front, and this seemed the quickest way. Hence his dandyism, his gorgeous attire, his two canes for morning and afternoon wear; hence, too, his early novels. *Vivian Grey*

Disraeli

(1826-27) is essentially a book written to capture attention Following this up with *Captain Popanilla* (1828), he then travelled for a year, after which, while standing unsuccessfully for Parliament, he wrote and published vigorously. The *Young Duke* (1831), *Contarini Fleming* (1832), *Alroy* (1833), *Henrietta Temple*, and *Venetia* (1837), besides lesser productions, occupied this period of frustrated ambition. It was the author of these books who got in for Maidstone, and made the famous "You shall yet hear me" speech These earlier books have much brilliance, some critics claim for them a high literary place To others they may seem little more than brilliant sketches, full of fault and promise, full of undigested Byronism and would-be-precocious cynicism, no more entitled than the work of a dozen other clever young men to any permanent position But it is quite otherwise with his next three novels After seven years of strenuous Parliamentary struggle, Disraeli, now acknowledged leader of the "Young England" party, published *Coningsby* (1844), *Sybil* (1845), and *Tancred* (1847) These books may have been political manifestoes, they are something much more now They are the most lifelike studies of political personages ever thrown into story form. To the common political novel they are as infinitely superior as their author was to the average member who follows the beck of his Whip.

How far Disraeli was in earnest is a fascinating problem His later novels, *Lothair* and *Endymion*, suggest the possibility of a negative answer, of inten-

tional trifling with his readers Even in this earlier trilogy Disraeli tries our patience hard The Bulwerian bombast, the sham scholarship and mysticism, the unreal flights of fancy, the general air of affectation and superiority, are all to be got over Common humanity has no interest for this writer· his loaves are all cakes, his rags are of silk and satin The gorgeous nonsense and pretence which pervade even his best work have been parodied for us by a master-hand Thackeray's inimitable *Codlingsby* —a burlesque bitterly resented, and repaid after many years by the sketch of "St Barbe" in *Endymion*— must not, however, blind us to the power which underlies all this perilous stuff and vapouring Sidonia may be shadowy, but Taper and Tadpole are real. Arab horses and "more curricles," fabulous diamonds and beings of preternatural intellect, move only to laughter, but the picture of Parliamentary conflict is Detoelike in its faithfulness One is never quite sure whether Disraeli is taking us and himself seriously, or whether he is laughing silently in his sleeve. His sardonic humour, bizarre imagination, and capricious vagaries of taste, give something of the interest of an unsolved enigma Much that at first seems ridiculous is found to be serious and purposeful, the dreams of "Tancred" came very near fulfilment during Lord Beaconsfield's premiership. But, conscious humourist or unconscious, natural or affected inditer of many purple passages, Disraeli is at least the novelist par excellence of politics, in letters as in life the dominant force in this one department at any rate. And, the

His habit of thought

more carefully we read these books, comparing them also with what is best and least unreal in his earlier productions, the more we shall probably be disposed to say that in his own line, and allowing for the idiosyncrasies of his very peculiar and un-English temperament, Disraeli is a master who might conceivably have given us work very much higher than anything he has done, while what he has done deserves at any rate to be placed apart in a class by itself

Other novelists

This quartette, then—or rather these two pairs, Bulwer Lytton and Disraeli, Thackeray and Dickens headed the novelists of a new era They carried on the work of Scott, and developed the novel in new directions, showing the way to an innumerable army of followers Of writers altogether contemporary with them a few may be named. Mrs Trollope and Mrs S C Hall handled themes of their own. Harriet Martineau (1802-76) won her spurs in weightier fields than the novel, but deserves special mention for *Deerbrook* (1839) and such delightful tales as *Feats on the Fiord* The Irish novel was pushed to perfection by Charles Lever (1806-72), who moreover did for our army something of what Marryat was doing for our navy. *Harry Lorrequer* (1840) and *Charles O'Malley* (1841), with others hardly less famous, carry us away by their rollicking humour, though we feel it exaggerated and one-sided. Samuel Warren (1807-77) achieved fame by *Ten Thousand a-Year* (1841), almost unreadable now through defects of style, his earlier *Diary of a late Physician* (1832) and other

Blackwood stories seldom rise above the commonplace. On the other hand, Mrs Gaskell (1810-65), only three years his junior, is charming in manner, and wholly modern in style, though of all her books *Mary Barton* (1848) is the only one which chronological considerations allow us to name

These considerations amount speedily to prohibition when we come to writers junior to the four great leaders The birth-year of Dickens is closely followed by those of such writers as Charles Reade, Mrs Henry Wood, the brothers Trollope, Charlotte Bronte, Charles Kingsley, and "George Eliot" But, with one exception, none of these writers produced any of their memorable work before the date at which our study closes A few still younger authors had made their *début*, such as James Grant (*Romance of War*, 1846) Mrs Craik (*The Ogilvies*, 1849), Mrs Oliphant (*Margaret Maitland*, 1849) Our account of the novel, however, must close with some sketch of the "one exception" referred to, whose work, with that of her sisters, may fairly be taken as belonging to our period

The Bronte family

Charlotte Bronte was born in 1816, being between four and five years junior to both Dickens and Thackeray She was married in 1854, and died a twelvemonth later. With the single exception of *Villette*, all her finished work, as well as that of her sisters, was published before 1850. Round the Bronte family a whole literature has grown up The sombre parsonage in a remote Yorkshire village, where the three girls and their unhappy brother cherished dreams of genius, attracts yearly an increasing

crowd of visitors The other members of that family may be briefly dealt with Branwell did nothing noteworthy Anne, four years younger than Charlotte, was but a replica of her sisters, and with her talent hardly rose to genius Emily (1818-48) had genius indeed, but revealed only in fragments She cannot be called a poet—the volume of poems by "Currer, Ellis, and Acton Bell," to use their pen-names, contains little but mediocre verse. Yet once or twice sheer stress of emotional thought lifts Emily's imperfect song-gift high into the region of pure poetry Nor can we call her novelist Yet she has left one tale, which stands almost by itself in English literature. *Wuthering Heights* (1847) is not a novel of any known type Its characters are scarcely human. Except the imaginary narrator, and Mrs Dean the nurse, they are creatures of diablerie rather than romance, and the atmosphere of the story suggests the hall of Eblis rather than earth The lurid power of the narrative makes us forget its many faults of construction, and *Wuthering Heights*, with one or two inspired snatches of verse, may well make Emily Bronte's name immortal. But Charlotte, the eldest, was much the most accomplished artist of the four, and had time for the largest output of work Her brother and sisters died in 1848-9, while she lived on in dreary solitude, brightened at the end by one year of married love When she too followed to the grave, she left three novels — *Jane Eyre* (1847), *Shirley* (1849), and *Villette* (1852)—besides unfinished sketches such as the *Professor*, a first draft of the

story afterwards worked up into *Villette*—which must permanently entitle her to a high place in any catalogue of British story-tellers

Place of Charlotte Bronte

Charlotte Bronte was the last of the Romantic novelists This is not a complete description, even if it may not be said too broadly, but it does seem to indicate one aspect of her genius After her, we come to sensation stories, novels of character, the modern novel in its various forms, she belongs still to the old school, despite freshness of handling and boldness of conception. Her lonely upbringing, the remoteness of her family home, to which news from the great world travelled slowly and at second-hand, gives her work an archaic air In what bygone world were these strange characters reared? Compare her with Mrs Gaskell, six years her senior, whom one would take to be younger by nearly a generation. And Miss Bronte's methods and ideals are as old-fashioned as her characters. True, she claims Thackeray as master But it is Thackeray on his neo-Romantic side, and his tendency to criticism repels her. She takes her ideals seriously More modern than he in her handling of sexual relation, she is delightfully antique in her views of soul-life Her youths and maidens—especially the latter —are frank with something of peasant frankness, yet nobly idealistic in their habits of thought. Sentiment, and even sensibility in Miss Austen's sense, go hand in hand with the boldest realism. This mixture gives strangeness and piquancy to her pictures of a time other than ours. We can listen indefinitely to

Shirley and Caroline talking, watch without weariness the minutely described play of school-life in *Villette*, and sympathise even with the heroics of *Jane Eyre*. The outcry against this last book seems indeed strange now and Lady Eastlake's review (if it was hers) blundering as well as brutal. Charlotte Brontë's method was no doubt more photographic than the refinements of her day sanctioned, her country frankness shocked the town lady's ears. But there is nothing unwholesome, nothing morbid or prying, in her pictures of life. Fidelity of portraiture, combined with loftiness of ideal, constitute her method and charm. Romanticism and Realism are seen in the act of blending. And it is fitting, therefore, that we take our leave of the English novel at this exact point. Charlotte Brontë marks the close of the movement we have sought to consider. The neo-Romantic impulse still discloses itself in her, but it is seen ready to pass into other forms. What were these forms, how many and widely diverging the manifestations they assumed, remains to be shown in the concluding volume of this series. One chapter in the evolution of our English novel has been, however roughly, sketched out in these pages, another, even more interesting to readers of to-day, still is left to tell.

Romanticism and democracy

Passing now finally from the novel, let us ask what other influences moulded English prose during the later years of our period, say from 1830 to 1850. They were years of strong intellectual ferment. The reform of Parliamentary

representation and repeal of the Corn Laws, the introduction of machinery into manufacture and steam travel into common life, bread riots, trade-union disputes, and Chartist agitation, the Tractarian movement which transformed the Church of England, and the fight for freedom from State control which rent in twain that of Scotland,—these were some of the movements which dominated men's minds It is not superfluous to note events like the abolition of Catholic disabilities in 1829 and of slavery in 1833, the introduction of a new Poor Law in 1835 and of penny postage in 1840, the famine in Ireland through failure of its potato crop in 1846, and the risings which shook Continental thrones in 1848 Such things impress the imagination, and reflect themselves in letters. They test or betoken the strength of ideals Their impact on serious literature must have been forceful indeed It may be less marked in the lighter branches we are now reviewing Yet even in these there seems an under-current of bitterness, of doubt and pessimism, of reaction from the Romantic ideal. Carlyle's work has been already noted. He voices strongly the unrest, the dissatisfaction, the impatience which filled men's hearts Hope there was too, but a far-off hope Ages of effort, it was felt, must precede any such millennium as Shelley anticipated The "Manchester School" might predict times of Quaker prosperity, to be brought about by Free Trade and universal disarmament. Leaders of literature saw farther and more clearly, and realised that individual oppression was

a bad basis for general prosperity Democracy rose on the ruins of Romanticism The two are of course not fundamentally inconsistent, but appeared so. To minds like those of the "Yorke family" in Miss Bronte's *Shirley* no compromise was possible Romance would disappear at the scream of the engine-whistle, baronial parks be cut up to make cabbage-gardens for the poor The greatest happiness of most could only be obtained by sacrifice of what was fairest in the old order

Popularising of knowledge

The nobler side of militant democracy was its zeal for popular education Penny Magazines and Cyclopædias, cheap editions of great authors, cabinets of instructive science and Societies for the diffusion of useful knowledge, marked its rise and progress The names of Charles Knight (1791-1873) and of William and Robert Chambers (1800-83 and 1802-71) are honourably connected with this branch of work, and all three wrote books besides compiling and editing Dionysius Lardner (1793-1859) started his *Cyclopædia* in 1830, while the same year saw the commencement of the *Edinburgh Cabinet Library*. Knight and Chambers followed suit shortly after, the years 1830-50 were full of such serial diffusions of "entertaining knowledge" Of general Encyclopædias there was no lack, but these were not novelties, the *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, by the brothers Chambers (1843), had more originality, as an attempt to popularise what had hitherto been left to scholars and students *Constable's Miscellany* and *Murray's Family Library* were also pioneers in the

work of issuing standard books at a moderate price. What with these, and the continual rise of new periodicals—such as *Knight's* and *Tait's Magazines*, *Bentley's Miscellany*, *Hogg's Christian Instructor*, and very notably *Chambers's Journal*, a true organ of popular culture—the generation we are dealing with had opportunity never before equalled for mastering, not merely facts of history and science, but literary methods and ideals The great writers of their day, and of previous days, were made accessible as they had never been before Not only was the "schoolmaster abroad" in the vulgar sense of cramming with dates and figures, but the highest models of thought and expression became for the first time familiar to the millions of our people

This, in turn, reacted on the writers themselves Democracy has its inspiration, whether by attraction or repulsion It is potent in a writer like Victor Hugo, it is not less so in apostles of reaction and decadence. These latter do not amount as yet to a school; we are still dealing with the rise and growth of democratical ideas. Everywhere "progress" is the cry, though a Carlyle may shake his head The world is to "spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change" Science and theology, as well as history and political philosophy, shall be "widened with the process of the suns" But it is time to cease from general reflection, and particularise, as in previous pages, by dealing with men rather than movements, or at least with movements only as impersonated by individual men

The influence of Romance on Art would take us too far afield It is tempting to discourse on this kindred movement, to cite such names as Blake and Haydon and Turner and Martin and Wilkie and David Scott But we must not leave our last One writer on art, however, requires special note—a writer still lingering among us, last survivor of a race of giants. John Ruskin (born 1819) comes into our period only in his youth. The first and second parts of *Modern Painters* (1843 and 1846), with the *Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849), alone fall within our province But these are enough to arrest Mr Ruskin's early prose was a marvel and delight, and exemplifies as exactly as possible the change which had come over prose writing We have nothing to do with its subject, any more than with the hundred other works on Art published during our period, from Hazlitt onward and downward What we are concerned to note is the many-coloured, many-cadenced, perfervid rhetoric of Ruskin's early style Prose now aspires to fulfil all functions of poetry Rhythm and melody are hers, though of wider and less recurrent sweep than that of verse One begins to understand why Carlyle exhorts the poet to write in prose, why in later years Whitman may think it possible to discard verse as a fetter and incumbrance. In prose like Ruskin's, and to some extent in Carlyle's (if he could forget hysteria and turbulence), we scarcely miss the subtler cadences of verse. Less artificial than De Quincey, weightier than Lamb, more melodious than Hazlitt,

Ruskin

cleaner built and neater than Coleridge, Ruskin's early prose perhaps sums up most perfectly the lesson of the Romantic Movement. It will be understood that the reference is to style alone. What the value of his thought—whether he himself was justified in the contempt with which in later years he cast pieces and rent to fragments the *gorgeous texture of his web*—we need not ask or discuss. But simply as style, as an embodiment of the new methods which had transformed English prose, and made it the perfect instrument we know—an instrument which there seems no reason to rank as second either to Greek in the old world or French in the new—Mr Ruskin's youthful writings were at once a mirror and model to the critic and an inspiration to the crowd of succeeding writers who caught up his ideas and his manner

These successors are clearly beyond our purview It may seem a bathos to pass from Mr Ruskin to the founding of *Punch* (1841) The contrast piquantly illustrates the versatility and many-sided character of the time. 'Mr Punch' too, may be styled a living writer, though the Mentors who presided over his hot youth have passed away. Punch in the 'Forties, in truth was a character other than what we know him. Radical and iconoclastic, he carried on vigorously the war against prejudice and conventionality. Foremost writers of the day contributed their best work to his pages. Thackeray gave the immortal *Snob* series, Hood the *Song of a Shirt* and *One more Unfortunate*, Douglas Jerrold the *Candle Lectures*, better than any of his novels.

'Punch'

Mark Lemon (1809-70), its first editor, was himself author of vivacious farces, tales, and essays. Punch's literary standard was higher in those early years, though the pictures were comparatively poor. And in truth the whole progress of *Punch* is not only a literary phenomenon, but a tribute to national good feeling. It is something to have satirised folly for over fifty years, without once stooping to rancid personality, without giving undue offence even to the serious, and without trespassing on ground forbidden by good taste or morals. No such record can be found in any other literature. Each new race of wits votes Punch dull and passé, and seeks new outlets for its "new humour." Punch goes on secure and steady, and it is wonderful how little his standard varies, how small gap is left when a chief contributor dies In his democratic youth, at any rate, *Punch* was a power in the land, to men of middle age it is curious to reflect what a guide and companion he has been through life, how rarely we have differed from him, how often sympathised, nor would any literary mirror of the time be worthy of its name which did not give a distinct reflection of that quaint figure which has now become one of the trusted exponents of social and political thought and feeling.

Miscellanea

The miscellaneous writing of which *Punch* was a chief example steadily went on increasing. Albert Smith and Gilbert A'Beckett, "Father Prout" and the Aytoun of Blackwood, were among its most noticeable exponents. Sir Arthur

Helps, in a quieter vein, developed the humour of his *Friends in Council* (first series, 1847) Borrow's *Bible in Spain* (1843) revealed a new writer, with taste and relish strikingly his own Less important as literature were the travel-books of this later section, Brenner and Davis and Samuel Laing and Mountstuart Elphinstone, or even the first *Journal of the Beagle* (1835) But Kinglake's *Eothen* and Eliot Warburton's *Crescent and Cross* (both 1844) are of the new school, and subordinate everything to literary effect, while Layard's Nineveh (1848), void of literary artifice, powerfully impressed popular imagination by its glimpses of a buried world

Conclusion

And here we must pause Completeness is even more impossible (if the Irishism be pardonable) in this chapter than in last. Writers of English prose, yet more than of English verse, were legion in those days Enough has probably been said to show how diversified and many-sided were their modes of working, how completely and with what variety of effect the movement we are reviewing had transformed the canons of our style This largeness and liberality, this freedom and wealth of colouring and width of sympathy and aspiration, flow directly from the Romantic Movement Even in our lighter departments of writing the effect has been traced. Next chapter will follow it into the field of didactic writing, seeking to show that there too the same disruption and supersession of ancient standards produced a result analogous to what we have seen in the realm of belles lettres.

CHAPTER III.

DIDACTIC LITERATURE HISTORY, SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY.

SCOPE OF THIS CHAPTER — HISTORICAL WRITING — SOME PIONEERS — HALLAM — THE NEXT DECADE — PRINCIPAL GROUP — ARNOLD — GROTE 'HISTORY OF GREECE' — THIRLWALL — OTHER MEMBERS OF GROUP — MACAULAY DEFECTS AND MERITS — LATER HISTORIANS — SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION — WRITERS ON SCIENCE — BUCKLAND AND SEDGWICK — FARADAY — HERSCHEL — MURCHISON — LYELL — OWEN — ROBERT CHAMBERS AND HUGH MILLER — DE MORGAN AND FORBES — DARWIN REFLECTS SPIRIT OF AGE — ITS RESULT IN THOUGHT — PHILOSOPHY PROPER — BENTHAM — JAMES MILL — AUSTIN — JOHN STUART MILL LIFE AND BOOKS — CHARACTER OF HIS WORK — HIGH PLACE AS A WRITER — SUCCESSORS TO MILL — INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL — HERBERT SPENCER — MACKINTOSH — OTHER INDEPENDENT THINKERS — COLERIDGE AS PHILOSOPHER MATTER AND MANNER — EFFECT OF HIS TEACHING — PUPILS OF COLERIDGE — SCOTTISH SCHOOL — HAMILTON STYLE AND METHOD — IMPRESSION PRODUCED — FOLLOWERS OF HAMILTON — INFLUENCE OF THIS SCHOOL — SEMI-PHILOSOPHICAL WRITERS — IMPORTANCE OF THEOLOGY — EVANGELICAL REVIVAL — BROAD CHURCH AND HIGH CHURCH — KEBLE — AUGUSTUS HARE — HAMPDEN — JULIUS HARE — PUSEY — NEWMAN HIS LITERARY POWER — MINOR AUTHORS — BISHOP WILBERFORCE — MANNING, AND OTHERS — EFFECTS ON LITERATURE — SCOTTISH DIVINITY — CHALMERS — HIS SUCCESSORS — CONCLUSION.

In approaching these weightier matters of the law, we must remember the necessary limitations of this

survey.[1] With the pædagogic value of the writers to be reviewed, the profit or harm caused by their speculations, we have little concern. We do not ask whether a scientific fact was established, an historical view proved correct, a religious or metaphysical doctrine based on true or false lines. Our criticism deals chiefly with matters of style and form, with the embodiment of research rather than the research itself. To show that the same revolutionary impulse which we have seen permeating all forms of imaginative literature is perceptible in treatises of graver import, shaping at once mental conception and rhetorical expression—such is the aim of this chapter. Many causes were at work, many influences moulded the thought and words of our professed teachers, investigators, and preachers But it is safe to say that all are results of one movement, that in the last resort—however diverse their manifestations—all were but various features of that completed change which is most succinctly styled the Romantic Triumph

Scope of this chapter

In History the change is especially noticeable. For a marked interval separated the great men of the old school from the leaders of the new Gibbon, and

[1] Chambers and Craik, as before. *Lives* of Macaulay, Grote, &c Miss Meteyard, *A Group of Eminent Englishmen* (1871). J S Mill's *Autobiography* (3rd ed , 1874). Darwin's *Life and Letters* (3 vols , 1887) Joseph Henry Green, *Spiritual Philosophy, founded on the Teaching of S T Coleridge*, with memoir (2 vols , 1865) Stanley's *Life of Arnold* (2 vols , 1844). Ward's *Oxford Movement* (1889). Recent *Lives* of Pusey, Manning, Jowett, &c Cockburn's *Memorials of his Time* (1856).

Hume, and Robertson — the courtly, full-dress historians of the previous Century, with their mannered style, their air of superiority, their leisurely erudition—left no immediate successors Of course historical writing still flourished Mitford, and Gillies, and Roscoe, historians by profession, Pinkerton and Chalmers, who were mainly antiquarians, William Godwin and Sir James Mackintosh, eminent in many fields besides history—all lived well into the time we have to consider. The chief imaginative writers themselves, moreover, made excursions into this field Southey's great History of Portugal never got itself written, as things chanced But he produced some studies of great merit, including a *History of Brazil* (1810-20), and his life of Nelson is a classic of our language His chief historical work, the *History of the Peninsular War* (3 vols, 1823-32), unluckily clashed with a more striking book, to be mentioned soon. Scott was of course a practised historian, as well as a voluminous writer of miscellanea His short *History of Scotland* (1830), written for Lardner's Cyclopædia, is good, but the delightful *Tales of a Grandfather* (1827) eclipse all competition in that line His Life of Napoleon (9 vols, 1827) was more a work of dauntless energy than a happily chosen task. Moore, Campbell, and several other of our poets also laboured at historical work But we may neglect such by-play, and go to the real students and writers of history And it will be best to preserve chronological order, beginning with contemporaries of Wordsworth and Scott,

Historical writing

and noting how the genius of composition changes when we come to those whose date of birth tinged them deeper with the Romantic dye.

Some pioneers

The earliest writers requiring mention here—earliest in date both of birth and publication—are Sharon Turner (1768-1847) and John Lingard (1771-1851). The first was a conscientious worker of the old type, whose best-known *History of the Anglo-Saxons* belongs to last Century, but who produced a History of England from the Norman Conquest to the Union with Scotland (1814-23) and other works during later life. Lingard's *History of England* (1819-30) was fiercely attacked as the work of a Roman Catholic, and can hardly be reckoned free from religious bias But it set an example of honest inquiry and original research Another veteran investigator, Dr Thomas M'Crie (1772-1835), wrote only ecclesiastical history (*Life of Knox*, 1812), and broke a lance with Scott over his views of the Covenanters. (A son of the same name carried on much the same work some twenty years after) James Mill (1773-1836), to be mentioned later as a thinker, deserves note here as author of a *History of British India* (1817-18), which however no longer keeps the place it took at the time of its publication

Hallam

Henry Hallam (1777-1859) may be accounted the last of the old school, or the first of the new. His calm sedate style has little indeed of Romantic colour; yet his ideals and admirations are wider than those of the Eighteenth

Century Born to fortune, Hallam lived a life of quiet dignity, more occupied with books than with affairs His *Middle Ages* came out in 1818, the *Constitutional History* in 1827, his *Introduction to the Literature of the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries* in 1837-39. Hallam's work was solid, decorous, and weighty. His opinions on history, especially that of our own Constitution, have perhaps outlived his literary judgments Yet the latter are always respectable, sane, safe as far as they go A more trustworthy guide, over large fields and taking general views, is not easily found Somewhat coldly correct, showing little sympathy or animation, Hallam's works are still ones which no library can be without, and his premier place was taken by right

Historians born in the 'Eighties of last Century are comparatively few Sir William Napier, K C B (1785-1860), one of a band of soldier-brothers, besides other works composed the immortal *History of the Peninsular War* (1828-40), which threw even Southey's into the shade This masterly book moves as if to the tap of drums and flash of bayonets, and the "majesty with which the British soldier" fought in the days of Brown Bess and the Iron Duke has not missed worthy chronicle. Sir Francis Palgrave (1788-1861), deputy-keeper of her Majesty's Records, wrote many learned works, including one on the *English Commonwealth* (1832), but his *History of Normandy and of England* belongs to the second half of our Century. Thomas Keightley (1789-1872) compiled school histories of Greece,

The most durable

Rome, and England Sir James Stephen (1789-1859), one of a well-known family, was Professor of History at Cambridge, and wrote books both of ecclesiastical and of secular history which were well received

Principal group.

It is when we come to writers born in the 'Nineties that the new leaven really works From twenty to thirty years younger than the first Romantic poets, they grew up in the new world, looked at problems with new eyes This interesting decade produced a plethora of historians Henry Hart Milman (1791-1868), Patrick Fraser Tytler (1791-1849), and Archibald Alison (1792-1867) lead the way Milman, a distinguished cleric, and poet of no mean order, wrote ecclesiastical histories which retain their value still The same may be said of Tytler's *History of Scotland* (1828-43), a work of independent research. Alison's immense histories—*Europe during the French Revolution* (10 vols, 1833-42), *Europe from the Fall of Napoleon* (9 vols, 1852-59)—earned him from Disraeli the name of "Mr Wordy," and have little vitality in them now Painstaking but prejudiced, Alison had learned in the school of *Maga* some of her bias and none of her brilliance, and wrote too exclusively from a Tory standpoint

But the greater lights are to come. George Grote (1794-1871), Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), Connop Thirlwall (1795-1875), are four names of great though unequal importance. Of less note, but interesting from our point of view, were Agnes Strickland (1796-1874), George Lillie Craik (1798-1876), William Mure (1799-1860), and

George Finlay (1799-1875) The list of historical writers born in the last decade of last Century is completed by the name of Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-59) A few words about some at least of these will illustrate the argument of this chapter

Arnold of Rugby may be taken first, as both the earliest removed by death, and to some extent the soonest antiquated His was a great influence in its day After high honours at Oxford, and ten years of private teaching at Laleham, he in 1828 became headmaster of Rugby, and what his work was there we all know from *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and many other sources Arnold never did parochial duty, and as cleric his teaching made mainly for manliness of life and wide-embracing looseness of creed. In history he did pioneer's work, introducing English readers to the revolutionary conceptions which German research had substituted for acquiescence in traditional story The early history of Rome was resolved into a mass of legends, little stress being laid on the realities which must have underlain these legends He wrote reviews and miscellaneous articles, edited Thucydides (3 vols., 1830-35), and made some progress with a *History of Rome* (1838-43), carrying it indeed to the end of the Second Punic War. A year before he died, he became Professor of Modern History at Oxford, and one volume of *Lectures on Modern History* (1842) was the first-fruit These, with his *School Sermons*, constitute his literary record. His personal influence,

Arnold

once so widely felt, is made real to us by the *Life* (1845) written most ably by his friend and pupil Dean Stanley, and has moulded the lives of accomplished sons and grandchildren. As historian, his notes are great boldness of conception, and vividness of detail and portraiture The latter—unmistakably derived from Scott and the Romantics—is accentuated by comparison of ancient with modern personalities, no longer treating historic characters as a race by themselves, but showing them men and women like us, actuated by like passions and pursuing similar aims.

This practice was carried still farther by Grote George Grote, banker and historian, with his clever and formidable wife, will be omitted from no picture of his time Educated for commerce, without university training, devoted to both philosophy and politics, he yet dared meet and beat the "dons" on their own pet ground of Greek History So early as 1826, he pulled Mitford's *History* to pieces in the *Westminster Review* A "philosophic Radical" of the Benthamite school, yet courteous and stately in manner, he worked hard in the uphill fight against privilege, sat in the reformed Parliament from 1832 to 1841, and two years later retired finally from his various spheres of action to concentrate himself on literature His *History of Greece*, in twelve volumes, appeared from 1846 to 1856, and was followed later by works on Plato and Aristotle, the latter unfinished Some minor writings were posthumously collected, and his *Personal Life*, by his widow, was published in

Grote

1873, while her life was written by Lady Eastlake (1880)

Grote's History may be called a counter-blast against Mitford's The latter had taken the Tory view of Hellenic questions, Grote frankly took the Radical, in particular protesting against the lampoons of Aristophanes being accepted as historical facts. Primitive legends, and the Homeric problem, were treated with sturdy iconoclasm; Wolf's theories about Homer, already familiar to the English public, being developed into an attempt to find an original kernel of Epic story In the main, the History is lively and pungent. Echoes of English political strife are heard continually. The pomp of old-fashioned style has quite gone, and a somewhat formless, not to say vulgar, loquacity takes its place Besides, the scale of proportion is unreasonably large, a fault shared by many histories of succeeding writers Trying to be thorough, they become tediously prolix Still, after all deduction, Grote's *Greece* remains a work of importance in itself, and still more as directing and developing the gifts and inclinations of those who came after.

History of Greece

Bishop Thirlwall was a real Broad Churchman, early brought under German influence Educated, like his senior contemporary Grote, at Charterhouse, he studied at Cambridge, translated Schleiermacher and Niebuhr, and lost his tutorship by supporting the admission of dissenters to degrees. As a country clergyman he wrote for Lardner's Cyclopædia his *History of Greece* (1835-47), which anticipated

Thirlwall

Grote's in date of publication, and many people think surpassed it in merit A better scholar than Grote, he was also less of a partisan, and his account of Greek history, while superior to Grote's in point of style, is probably more trustworthy in general tone. But for the popularity of Grote's work, Thirlwall's would undoubtedly have been *the* Greek history of his time. In form he is free without being slovenly, and sympathetic without showing bias His promotion to the See of St David's, and the excellent work he did for his Church both in England and Wales, need not detain us at present

With Grote and Thirlwall may be coupled Colonel Mure, who wrote a history of the literature instead of the politics of Greece (first volume, 1850), based on German sources, and profiting by the topographical researches which had been carried on for a generation by Lieutenant-Colonel Leake (1777-1860), Sir William Gell (1777-1836), and others including himself, and George Finlay, the historian of modern Greece, of whose *History* the first instalment appeared in 1844 Miss Strickland is well known by her *Lives of the Queens of England* (1840-48), and similar compilations. Craik edited the *Pictorial History of England* (1840-44), a work planned by Charles Knight, and one out of many anticipations of a conception of history sometimes supposed to have originated with Mr J. R. Green. The immense work done by Carlyle was so fully noticed in last chapter that it seems needless now to dwell on his *History of the French Revolution* (1837) or *Cromwell* (1845) Beyond all

Other members of group

doubt, the old order had passed away before Carlyle was possible. His explosions and ejaculations, his humour and his satire, would be as incongruous in the pages of an Eighteenth Century historian as his stormy sentiment and realistic sympathy would have been felt beneath the dignity of the elder writer

There remains Lord Macaulay And he fitly closes one century, begins another His Review articles were in 1843 gathered into the well-known *Essays* Most of these are historical, and display the characteristics later shown on larger scale in his *History of England* (first two volumes, 1848) Compared with his master Hallam, Macaulay is of the moderns; compared with Carlyle, of the ancients. Trained in public life, Macaulay reads history like a politician. He never quits the Old Whig standpoint As Alison had "shown that Providence was on the side of the Tories," so Macaulay sees Heaven smiling on Whig aims and ideals The "cock-sureness" of the man reflects itself in his style Nothing is left in shadow or doubt. An astonishing amount of detail is marshalled with skill into its place. Brilliant description, dazzling antitheses, drive home each conception. It is impossible to doubt the author's meaning, almost impossible for the moment to think there can be another side to the question. We are pelted with facts, deafened with instances, driven from pillar to post by a pressure of merciless rhetoric. The hard, brassy, ringing style brooks no pause, softens no rigour of statement Men are either villains or heroes, principles either righteous or despicable. Add that

Macaulay

Macaulay read widely, knew his subject "like a book," had studied topography with delight and diligence; also that he made his story as interesting as a Waverley novel The account of Monmouth's conspiracy, the sending of the bishops to the Tower, enthral us like a chapter of *Ivanhoe* or *Quentin Durward* Small wonder that his readers went wild over the successive volumes as they appeared, that the sale was prodigious, the author's receipts a marvel of the trade

Defects and merits

From Scott and Macaulay most of us who are not students of history derive the bulk of our historical knowledge and ideas. And in the main we have small cause to grumble But of the two Macaulay gives way more to partisanship, finds it more difficult to do justice to opponents. As to inaccuracies, both commit them occasionally. Dryasdust critics delight to pick holes in Macaulay The wonder is that they find so few, considering his range Yet it must be owned that those they do find are sometimes due more to prejudice than oversight. Every man can make slips, not every man need let a fixed idea run him into error Macaulay's treatment of Boswell, for instance, shows positive infirmity of judgment, his picture of Johnson is exaggerated even to caricature But, if we make sufficient allowance for the defects of his qualities, we may generally rely on what remains. A more serious misfortune was the unreasonably large scale on which he planned his narratives. In the introduction to his first volume he proposed to carry this down to "a time which is within the memory of men still living." Yet, beginning with 1685, he was able

barely to complete the Seventeenth Century, and the whole Eighteenth remains untouched Fragment as it is, however, Macaulay's *History* is a possession for ever Its living pictures cannot be superseded For good or evil, history is made visible, tangible The man who runs may carry away a picture, misleading perhaps in some details, but how true and living as a whole! The spirit of reality which informed Scott's novels, which made his characters like live men and women to us, has touched Macaulay's page through the rhetoric, with somewhat similar result History may be written falsely hereafter, but never again vaguely It may lose itself in multiplicity of details, but this is due to the very strenuousness of its search for reality *Actuality* is the great note of the new school, and Macaulay, with all his faults, splendidly and persistently struck this note.

Later historians

With Macaulay the change we have looked for was fairly consummated After him came a race of less eminent writers, respectable rather than brilliant. History became a science, or rather the scientific side overlaid the pictorial Lord Mahon, afterwards Earl Stanhope (1805-75), did excellent work, including a *History of England* from 1713 to 1783, which usefully but more prosaically supplements Macaulay's. Sir George Cornewall Lewis (1806-63) carried doubt into denial as regards legend, just as he refused to believe in any person living to the age of one hundred. John Mitchell Kemble (1807-57), nephew of Mrs Siddons, studied German and Old English, and produced a standard *History of*

the Saxons in England (1849). Charles Merivale (1808-93), Dean of Ely, worthily carried on the tradition of Thirlwall, but published nothing of importance before 1850 The same fact renders inadmissible the names of William Forbes Skene (1809-92) and John Hill Burton (1809-81), whose labours on Scottish history are alike and yet different John Forster (1812-76), a prominent literary figure of his day, wrote excellent historical essays, his earliest book being *Lives of the Statesmen of the Commonwealth* (1840). And then we come to a group of younger men, to Froude, Buckle, Freeman, Bishop Stubbs (the names are given chronologically), followed later by Green and Dr Lecky. This will sufficiently show the evolution of historical writing since Macaulay. Through its earlier part, be it remembered, Carlyle was still raging apart, supreme in his own way, and even in old age towering like a demigod above his contemporaries. He, too, was great for accuracy at all costs, though to dry bones of fact he gave fiery breath of life. And, in the reaction against Macaulay, it may be said that accuracy has tended to replace vividness Why the two should be incompatible it is hard to see, but, in spite of the great counter-influence of Carlyle, that is the distinction habitually made by most of our recent historical critics.

Summary and conclusion

These forty years of historical writing, then, saw the change from the laboured, formal, *ex Olympo* style of last century to the vivid, realistic, sympathetic narrative that succeeded Of course generalisations never hold entirely. There

were great men before Agamemnon, and Romantic writers before the Romantic Revival The idea that history is concerned with the life and manners of a people as well as with battles and coronations is no new thing in the earth Livy, if not Thucydides, held it up as his ideal. But its recognition came as a surprise in our own Century, and Macaulay's brilliant picture of the state of England at the time he described had the freshness of novelty to his readers The key-note so struck has dominated historical writing since, and to Carlyle more than any one else we owe its predominance Possibly, in our love of detail, we have somewhat lost or neglected the art of presenting wholes What Matthew Arnold called the architectonic faculty tends to be left in abeyance. The Muse of History assumes the task and dress of a serving-maid, *mémoires pour servir*, in fact, are precisely what we offer for history nowadays But this insistence on accuracy, this multiplication of details, this resolute endeavour to realise at all cost the actual life of past ages, is noble work in itself, and indispensable as a preliminary to future histories Our chronicles form the base and scaffolding on and with which new historians will build. But we need not regard the foundation as itself the building, nor disparage the stately if sometimes unsubstantial architecture of our fathers Perhaps a new Revival is somewhat wanted to insist afresh on the value of form, a new Carlyle or Macaulay to inspire, each after his own fashion, historical dry bones with life The part played by these and lesser

writers in transforming our ideas of history has at any rate now been sufficiently indicated

Writers on science

The attention given to Natural Science during the years we are considering forms a prominent feature of the time The conditions of our inquiry forbid any but the curtest treatment of this important section. Here, again, we have to do not with actual discoveries or inventions, but with their effect on the writing of the day Some notice of the chief workers, however, seems as before the easiest way to describe this effect, and chronological order the best to follow. John Dalton (1766-1844), author of the "atomic theory" in chemistry, and Robert Brown (1773-1858), the greatest of English botanists, may be regarded as leading the way, Dalton in particular acting pioneer in many departments of science Sir Humphry Davy (1778-1829) followed Dalton in width of culture, and particularly interests us as having been a friend of Scott, Coleridge, and Southey, and himself an essayist in literature (*Salmonia*, 1828; *Consolations of Travel*, 1830), though his fame of course rests on his chemical researches and the safety-lamp invented by him Sir David Brewster (1781-1868) was another man of large knowledge, pre-eminent in optics, but writing *Letters on Natural Magic* (1830) to Sir Walter Scott, "general" books like *More Worlds than one* (1854), and a host of minor treatises. He edited the *Philosophical Journal* for years, and also the seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1826-42), and was one of the founders of the British

Association for the Advancement of Science. Davy and Brewster were typical instances of the "encyclopædic" man of science, who has almost disappeared now in the necessary subdivision of departments Their width of view freed them from microscopic narrowness, and was compatible with a literary training and even a literary achievement rarely found among the lifelong students of one particular branch of knowledge

William Buckland (1784-1856) and Adam Sedgwick (1785-1873) were more of specialists, being addicted to what was then a new science, geology. Dean Buckland (he was made Dean of Westminster in 1845), when a clerical fellow at Oxford, and later as Canon of Christ Church, introduced his University to these new and dangerous speculations, Sedgwick did the same at Cambridge, where he too was a clerical fellow Both men, though regarded as innovators, were tolerably conservative at heart, and Sedgwick in particular strenuously resisted some later developments in his and other sciences. The humanising influence of such men, however, was most valuable, both within and outside their own province

Buckland and Sedgwick

Michael Faraday (1791-1867), a pupil of Davy's, devoted himself to chemistry and electricity. It is amusing to remember that when Brown, Dalton, Brewster, and Faraday received Oxford degrees in 1832, Keble and Newman resisted the proposal because all four were dissenters. We have travelled far since then. Faraday, of humble birth,

Faraday

was a simple and devout Christian, but "kept his religion and his science in watertight compartments" His influence, exercised both through written papers and attractive lectures, was on the side at once of research and reverence

Herschel

Sir John Frederick William Herschel (1792-1871), son of the famous astronomer, was Senior Wrangler in 1813, and a profound mathematician as well as a practical astronomer; besides making experiments in sound, light, and particularly photography. He wrote for *Lardner's Cyclopædia*, the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and published also volumes of lectures and addresses He may therefore be regarded as one of those who popularised knowledge, making possible that widespread interest in "the fairy tales of science and the long results of time" which is so marked a feature of the age He found leisure also for literary work, and in particular wrote the "accentual hexameter" with as much success as any beyond the real poets who tried it. His translation of Schiller's *Wall* is in this metre, in which he also rendered some books of the Iliad.

Murchison.

Sir Roderick Impey Murchison (1792-1871) was another of the wicked geologists, whose speculations so disturbed men's minds in the 'Forties of this Century. A soldier in the Peninsular War, he left the army in 1816 to devote himself to science and travel. By examination of some rock-forms sent from Australia, he was able to foretell the discovery of gold in that continent. Murchison's

name is associated with the Silurian system of rock-structure, a title given by him to strata found in the ancient Roman province of that name He was one of that brotherly band of workers who started the "British Association," of which he was President in 1846, and was also for many years President of the Royal Geographical Society His published books are on geology alone

Sir Charles Lyell (1797-1875) was yet another geologist, having been drawn to that science by hearing Buckland's lectures at Oxford If no special discovery is associated with his name, yet his *Principles of Geology* (1830-32) was a work of stirring interest in its day, just thirty years later his *Antiquity of Man* (1863) startled a later orthodoxy The ashes seem cold to us now walking over them, but sparks of passion long lingered there. His refusal to admit cataclysmic changes, and consequent postulating of enormous periods of time, in the past history of our earth, brought him into collision with many by no means illiberal thinkers. The clang of this controversy, indeed, may be heard through most of the speculative writing of the day

Lyell

Sir Richard Owen (1804-92) must follow next, as being in anatomy much what Lyell was in geology The extraordinary brilliance of Owen's work appears from the story of his divining an Australian bird (and that a bird without wings!) from one fragment of its thigh-bone, and finding his forecast justified by subsequent discovery. His catalogue of the Hunterian collection, his monographs on

Owen

animals of all sorts, from the *Pearly Nautilus* (1832) to the *Gorilla* (1865), and his countless labours and honours, scientific and philanthropic, go for less here than the effect he produced on his contemporaries. This was immense through life, but it may be noted that in later years Owen applied the drag rather than the spur in hypothetical speculation. Cautious as he was bold, Owen's reputation stands secure amid the welter of theory, and can afford to divide honours with the greatest of his day

Robert Chambers and Hugh Miller

Prior to Owen in date of birth were two men of less scientific note but of considerable literary importance Robert Chambers (1802-71), one of two brothers named in last chapter, must be mentioned here as the author of *Vestiges of Creation*, a book published anonymously in 1844, which created a great stir by its supposed unorthodox tendency Hugh Miller (1802-56) was a geologist of no mean rank, endowed with writing faculty of quite unusual kind. Working as a mason till his short life was more than half spent, he raised himself to be an original investigator, a foremost journalist, and author of a delightful series of scientific, quasi-scientific, and purely literary books *Scenes and Legends of the North of Scotland* (1835) was the first of these, the *Old Red Sandstone* appeared in the newspaper he edited, and as a book in 1841, while of the others the most important were *Footprints of the Creator* (1850) and *Testimony of the Rocks* (1857), whose purport is indicated by their titles. Men like Murchison, Buckland, and Agassiz welcomed him

warmly, and his scientific work is of independent value. But he is mentioned here as perhaps the ablest of those who translated science into popular terms, and familiarised ordinary readers with the original work of the day Overburdened by work, and the strain of a great religious movement, he shot himself one winter morning in his study

Augustus de Morgan (1806-71) was one of the first mathematicians of his age, but is better known by his work on Logic (1847) and his *Budget of Paradoxes* (in book form, 1872). Professor James David Forbes (1809-68) was an investigator in Natural Philosophy, and a keen explorer, whose *Travels through the Alps* (1843), *Norway and its Glaciers* (1853), &c, first brought under notice the theory of ice action afterwards worked out by Prof Tyndall He should be distinguished from a younger Prof. Edward Forbes (1815-54), a naturalist of high rank, and like his namesake for some time professor at Edinburgh University

De Morgan and Forbes

To the foregoing might have been added many names of interest rather than importance, such as Mrs Mary Somerville (1780-1872), Charles Babbage (1791-1871), author of the calculating machine, Professor Baden Powell (1796-1860), Sir George Airy (1801-92), and so forth But this were to transcend the purport of our enumeration. Special mention should perhaps have been made of one set of essays, the *Bridgewater Treatises* (eight volumes, 1833-36), an attempt to exploit science in the interests of religion, made by eminent writers, of whom however Dean

Buckland alone has been referred to in the previous paragraphs But the general attitude of the time to science will probably have been suggested by the remarks already made, and but one more name need be added, that of a writer as distinguished as any that have gone before, though his most important work was done after the time we are specially surveying.

Darwin

Charles Robert Darwin (1809-82) came of a literary stock, but gave up all interest in pure literature through the engrossment of research. All the same, his books possess, if not style, a studious simplicity of narration which replaces style, and perhaps argues dormant literary power His *Voyage of the Beagle* (best edition, 1845), the book which occupied him for years in recording results of a world-wandering which itself had occupied five years, was referred to in last chapter His epoch-making *Origin of Species* did not appear till 1859 But the train of thought which culminated in that book had filled his mind for many years, and was not by any means peculiar to himself. The popular idea that Darwin "discovered evolution" cannot of course survive the slightest study of the subject It is not merely that the idea itself is as old as Aristotle, had been postulated by Vico and dwelt on by Lamarck, and was made use of by Darwin's own grandfather (Erasmus Darwin, quaint combiner of what to the Eighteenth Century seemed science and seemed poetry) Nor even that a fellow-worker with Darwin, Dr Alfred Russell Wallace, is fairly entitled to share

the credit of bringing forward this specific theory. The point is rather that "evolution" was an ancient and familiar idea, which had been more and more coming into general use as a stable working hypothesis Darwin's deathless glory is that he took up this more or less shadowy idea, worked at it through years of patient study, and finally formulated it so clearly and substantiated it with such wealth of illustration that what he himself promulgated as a probable hypothesis bade fair to become an article of scientific faith. The dogmatism of Science, being expugnable by argument, is less dangerous to mankind than its ecclesiastical counterpart, but there was a time, not so long ago, when it really seemed as if any one daring to regard "Darwinianism" as aught less than gospel truth would be visited by the pains and penalties of scientific anathema—when even to hint that the "evolution theory" did not speak the last word about man's character and destiny was to incur the charge of hopeless inability to understand rudimentary fact

Darwin himself, most modest of great thinkers, was not to blame for this And neither the importance of his work nor its influence on his age can easily be overstated It is not too much to say that it has wholly transformed the average man's conception of life and nature, introduced new standards, new methods, and a new ideal to judge by. If Carlyle was the most fruitful man of letters of the middle portion of the Nineteenth Century, Darwin was the most fruitful man of science.

Reflects spirit of age

By *fruitful* is here meant stimulating and arousing, being the cause of fruit-production in others, perhaps *seminal* would be the more exact word The world never seems quite the same again to one who has looked through Darwin's eyes The man was great, but still greater was the age that bore him, the time that nurtured his speculation to maturity. That time was the one we are trying to realise throughout this volume, the scientific side of which has been under review in the last few pages Darwin sums up and embodies that time, and carries one of its main speculations to victorious issue. In studying him, we shall learn almost better than in any other way what was the scientific drift, the scientific preoccupation, of the forty years which form our subject.

Its result in thought

A new conception of the solidarity and rationality of the universe emerged as the main result of this drift Not that these ideas are new, of course, but that they have been set in new light The immense advance in various special branches of science may have obscured this for the time There was a tendency to regard these as the real object of thought Science, in the narrower sense of the word, seemed to claim "the promise and the potency" of all rational development This tendency perhaps reached its height about the close of the period we are considering, or a little later. Intoxicated by the startling joy of new discovery, by the rapid and general extension of what had so long passed for set boundaries of human knowledge, men seemed content to limit attention to what was tangible

and visible, even to refuse belief in whatever was not cognisable by the senses Materialism waxed fat as the fashionable creed; physical progress, creature-comforts, were the direct objects of desire. And there is much in this way of thinking which commends itself to the practical, well-fed Briton Yet the student of history and literature does not expect such an attitude to be final He knows that human nature is not so very different now from what it has always been. He is not greatly surprised even to find that this identical epoch witnessed a recrudescence of the cruder forms of spiritualism and table-turning "Just when we're safest, there's a sunset-touch," &c Such phenomena, however — except in the case of "Sludge, the medium" — have no connection with literature. We pass from these, to consider in very general outline the philosophic work of the age.

Philosophy proper

From Darwin to pure speculative thought is no very violent transition Natural inquiry pushed fearlessly home lands us in metaphysic, and his system ultimately compelled recognition of the old truth that beyond the *flammantia mœnia mundi* of our knowledge there lies in every direction a region of mystery, which only despair or cowardice can avoid seeking to penetrate English philosophical schools during these forty years were divided into two distinct groups. The most influential work of the period must be held to have been done elsewhere; since Hegel lived till 1831, and Comte till well past 1850. But our insular philos-

ophy, while indebted to both France and Germany, had a stamp of its own John Stuart Mill was a student of Comte, yet cannot be called a follower. German thought began to tell on us, yet at the very end of our period Mansel could satirise the

> "land of one Kant with a K,
> And of many Cants with a C"

Personal conservatism may explain this instance, but there was a strong anti-Teutonic feeling in many quarters. The most convenient division, however, is between the followers of Bentham and Austin on the one hand, and on the other an idealistic school, some of whom followed Coleridge—great influence philosophically as poetically—in his study of German metaphysic, while others developed the "Scottish School" of thought, under the leadership of Sir William Hamilton. We may take the more compact group first

Bentham

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) survived well into our time But his best work was over, and his later writings ill deserve the name of literature His influence, however, was great and growing He had reduced common-sense (using the word with no technical connotation) to a system, and introduced the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" principle into morals and politics This phrase he is said to have taken from Priestley, but it is older far, at least in idea; the novelty was its use as a universal rule. Utility, as a touchstone of right and wrong,

was a conception familiar to the Greeks, "utilitarianism" as a definite creed had hardly been formulated before the time we speak of, and Bentham gave the initiative. His *Rationale of punishments and rewards* (1825) is said to have been written fifty years before it was published, and at any rate only summed up what he had influentially taught for many years to his chosen disciples Bentham was the founder of a school, and one need not look for a systematised *corpus* of philosophy in his writings He was rather the Socrates who touched on many subjects, illuminating them all with his critical search-light, and leaving his disciples to gather up fragments into a whole The Plato who was to do this came in time Bentham has been not inaptly compared to Hobbes, and there is much in the later Englishman that recalls the earlier. But we have to do here with his followers rather than himself

James Mill (1773-1836) was one of the strongest of these Like his master, he dealt with many subjects, breaking ground first as a historian (ante, p 134), and writing largely on legal and economical questions But his *Analysis of the Human Mind* (1829) and *Fragment on Mackintosh* (1835) were real contributions to philosophy. Perhaps James Mill is a little merely the able man, who writes well on psychology as he would on any other subject; as Johnson thought any able man could write poetry if he tried. But if there is nothing very original in his work, it is always of masterly clearness He took his *association* philosophy from older writers,

James Mill

but systematised its statement with admirable precision James Mill was a typical representative of the English *Aufklärung*, in its strength and its weakness, its fervour and its narrowness His son (to be mentioned immediately) may have been an abler writer than his father, but he was perhaps not an abler man.

John Austin (1790-1859) developed one side of Bentham's teaching with such success as entitles him to be called a second founder of the school Jurisprudence was his subject, and his application of the principle of utility in this sphere revolutionised the teaching of legal ethics After serving in the army, and lecturing in University College (or London University as it was then called), he published his *Province of Jurisprudence determined* (1832), and was appointed member of the Criminal Law Commission. Failing health led him to reside abroad, for three years in Germany, for four more in Paris During these seven years, and nine more till his death, he published little, but some *Lectures on Jurisprudence* appeared after his death, in 1863 Little as he printed, Austin influenced his age immensely, and, with his brother Charles (a prosperous lawyer), seemed capable of highest leadership But his great gifts were expended in the service of a narrow school.

Austin

John Stuart Mill (1806-73) must be deemed the perfected flower and consummation of that school. He played the part of Plato, gathering up the *disjecta membra* into a completed whole. In so doing, most

people think, he strained his fundamental principle beyond what it could bear. By admitting differences of kind between pains and pleasures he breached the rampart of utilitarianism; by recognising "permanent possibilities of sensation" behind the flux of phenomena he quitted the vantage-ground of pure associationism, without going far enough to repel in advance the idealistic onslaught. But, if errors, these were generous ones, proceeding from an anxious spirit of fairness, and a refusal to shut his eyes to light from whatever quarter. Dispassionate candour is Mill's leading quality as a thinker, while his writing faculty was fine and finely trained. As writer, indeed, Mill reached very high excellence, and his influence on contemporaries was a force of the very first rank

John Stuart Mill

Born in London, Mill was educated by his father on a system of extraordinary rigour, a full account of which is given by the son in his *Autobiography* (posthumously published) The wonder is that any original power survived such a forcing process "I never was a boy," he says himself, and he might have added that he never was a child. Beginning Greek at three years old, he had read before he was fourteen more widely than most undergraduates of twenty Visiting France at the latter age, he came back to study history and philosophy, and at seventeen took a place under his father at the India Office. Young Mill was now the rising hope of philosophic Radicals. His early contributions to the *Westminster Review* first delighted and then began to

Life and books

pain them. The best of these are included in the first three volumes of *Dissertations and Discussions* (in book form, 1859), and remain charming to read. The crystal clearness of thought and style, the freedom from bias and generous appreciation of adversaries, may truly be called ideal. The articles on *Coleridge* and *Bentham* are especially remarkable, and must have not a little astonished his father's friends. For Mill was outgrowing the narrow garment of rationalist orthodoxy; its seams gaped in all directions plain to see. Still he remained a recognised leader, and his great *System of Logic* (1843) is a treasure-house of the thoughts and criticisms of the school to which he belonged, just as his *Political Economy* (1848) is the most readable account of the sociological doctrine of that school. His subsequent works, including the *Utilitarianism* (1861), *Examination of Hamilton* (1865), and edition of his father's *Analysis* (1869)—with such lesser but stimulating books as the *Liberty* (1859), *Comte and Positivism* (1865), *Subjection of Women* (1869), and perhaps the early written but posthumously published *Essays on Religion*—pass beyond our proper limit. Even the writings named do not exhaust his publications. But enough has been said to recall how vast and varied was his influence on his countrymen. Whether we accept his teaching or not, it is impossible to deny Mill's place as one of the foremost writers of his time.

And this place was thoroughly deserved. To the end Mill retained the qualities which were so attractively manifested in his earlier writings. He could

hit hard sometimes He combats Hamilton vigorously,
Character of his work and thinks proper to warm himself to rhetorical boiling-point over Mansel's denying our knowledge of the sense in which God is good. But his usual characteristics are moderation and fairness, and he never hit below the belt In him were presented most favourably the ideas of the extreme Radical school Radical of course it was in every sense of the word, ready to make a clean sweep of much that his countrymen held dear Closely allied to French thought, it shared the thoroughness and *doctrinairism*, as well as the clearness, of its congener. To it also Clericalism was the enemy, and there was really no room in its system for any form of religion That Mill had religious feelings, is to his credit as a man, but was a doubtful boon to him as philosopher The spirit of this creed spread widely and sank deeply, Victorian literature is full of its influence and teachings It survived in the combative agnosticism of Huxley and Tyndall, and has left its mark on our age for good or evil John Stuart Mill was the most accomplished and most powerful representative of this school, and divides with Sir William Hamilton the reputation of being foremost philosopher of his time.

Mill had become head of the India Office before his retirement in 1858. He sat in Parliament for a few
High place as a writer years late in life, but did not quite attain the position there that might have been anticipated. Long a bachelor, he was powerfully influenced by his friendship with Mrs Taylor, whom he married in 1851. Her teaching is said to have done much to

retain him in the Rationalist fold, and is acknowledged in somewhat extravagant terms in the preface to *Subjection of Women*. Few who studied Mill in their youth can forget the impression he made on them. The vigour and the clearness, the perfect courtesy and yet insistence on points of weakness constitute a lesson in thought as well as in style. And from the narrower standpoint of purely literary judgment one can have little hesitation in giving him the premier place among the speculative writers of his day.

Successors to Mill.

The school which culminated in Mill barely survived his loss. No immediate leader succeeded to anything like his place and position. Perhaps Alexander Bain (born 1818) came nearest to wearing his mantle and his important books (all later than 1850) have certainly done much to systematise and bring to date the doctrines of Empiricism. Another powerful recruit of whom as dead one can speak with more freedom was George Henry Lewes (1817-78). *Littérateur par excellence* author of two rather striking novels—*Ranthorpe* (1847) and *Rose Blanche, and Violet* (1848)—and of a *Life of Goethe* (1855) which is quite a standard work, contributor to endless magazines, and first editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, Lewes spent much time on both scientific and philosophical writing, though he cannot be credited with any really original work in either. His *History of Philosophy*, originally published as a *Biographical History of Philosophy* (1845): *Comte's Philosophy of the Sciences* (1853), *Aristotle* (1864), and *Problems of Life and Mind* (1874 *seq.*), constitute

his claim to record here. Not an original thinker of first rank, Lewes was rather a "smart" than a deep man. It was always matter of some surprise to George Eliot's friends that she should have taken up with Lewes; and his influence is understood to be responsible for the pedantic terminology in which she delighted to clothe her thought during later years. On the other hand, Lewes certainly encouraged and probably suggested her first writing of novels In his own books, Lewes impresses more favourably than he seems to have done in real life He is always readable, and seldom or never disagreeable. That he did much for philosophy, probably cannot be contended, but he was an effective *raconteur*, and in his chosen department of historical or biographical writing did good service, putting his points always clearly and usefully

Influence of school

Austin's side of the Benthamite work was developed and supplemented by Sir Henry Maine (1822-88) and Sir James Fitzjames Stephen (1829-94), the latter the son of the Sir James Stephen mentioned earlier in this chapter But as neither of these writers had been even called to the Bar before 1850, it would be out of place to do more than name them here. The influence of the School, as noted above, after Mill's death is less an affair of individual writers than of a widespread habit of thought, whether in the region of jurisprudence or in the larger world of general philosophy. In this form its operation was important and general, and may fairly be said to have survived even to our own time

One later writer, indeed, has not merely attained to a pre-eminence greater than Mill's, but has developed the teaching of this school of philosophy with a profundity and a coherence to which Mill could lay no claim. But the writings of Herbert Spencer (born 1820) belong too manifestly to the next generation to allow of notice here. *Social Statics* was indeed published in 1850, and even before that he had written papers on economic and social problems. But the great cycle of books which embody his system of Synthetic Philosophy were not begun till long after our period.

Herbert Spencer

Divisions are never exhaustive, and Sir James Mackintosh (1765-1832) does not fit in easily under any of our headings. Older than James Mill or Austin, he spent most of his life on the higher politics and the higher jurisprudence, going for seven years to Bombay in a judicial function, and entering Parliament after his return to England. But he had always the name of a philosopher, and during the last year of his life justified it by publishing his *Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy* (1831), written for the supplementary volume added to the seventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, but left unfortunately incomplete. It may be mentioned that he wrote a short *History of England* for *Lardner's Cyclopædia* (3 vols., 1830-32), and had worked at a history of the Revolution of 1688. Mackintosh had great reputation among his contemporaries, as has been said, and the *Dissertation* shows

Mackintosh.

it was well deserved. Lucid exposition, admirable arrangement, and critical judgment of the first order are in evidence throughout. It called forth James Mill's *Fragment* previously mentioned, and has taken its place as a standard history of English Ethics As a historian of philosophy, if not a philosopher proper, Mackintosh could evidently have taken high rank, and his style is delightful. His own opinions, so far as can be judged from the *Dissertation*, leaned strongly to eclecticism. Though admitting utility as a test, he contended for the separate existence of a moral faculty, not innate in its present fulness, but capable of growth and development, and this was the contention which especially called forth the diatribe of the elder Mill

Other independent thinkers

Nor perhaps should Isaac Taylor (1787-1865), Richard Whately (1787-1863), or William Whewell (1794-1866) be classed as members of a school Taylor was one of a well-known family, and spent most of his life at Ongar (so associated with them), writing there such works as the *Natural History of Enthusiasm* (1829), *Natural History of Fanaticism* (1833), *Physical Theory of Another Life* (1836), &c His father, and his better-known son, both bore the same name as himself. Archbishop Whately was a man of strong personality, who wrote many books on clerical and general subjects, including the satirical *Historic Doubts* (1819), but who comes in here by virtue of his excellent manuals on *Logic* (1826) and *Rhetoric* (1828), both enlarged from contributions to an Encyclopædia. William Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, was another forceful

writer, who contributed equally to the popularising of science and philosophy, and also ventured into pure literature, writing hexameters, translating *Hermann und Dorothea*, &c. He contributed one of the *Bridgewater Essays* before referred to, but his best-known books are his *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837), *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1840), and perhaps *Plurality of Worlds* (1853). Whewell was a man of encyclopædic knowledge, and as Master of his College delighted to show it. None of these men, able as all three were, did much to found or build up any particular school of thought. But they were writers of weight and authority, and must be taken into account in reckoning the influence of philosophical writing on English literature.

Coleridge as philosopher

Among those who opposed the doctrine of Experimentalism, one important section followed the lead of Coleridge. From 1816 to 1834 Coleridge dwelt at Highgate, writing little, but pouring out to admiring hearers those wonderful monologues which have been described too satirically by Carlyle, and more sympathetically by many others. *Aids to Reflection* came out in 1825, *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit* and the *Essay on Method* were posthumously published. But it was by spoken rather than by written word that Coleridge as a philosopher influenced his time. Coleridge, De Quincey, and Carlyle did more than any others to popularise German thought in England, but the latter two kept mainly to literature, Coleridge alone explored habit-

ually the arcana of metaphysics. How great was the work so done, a moment's reflection will show The trim, balanced, bounded speculation of the later eighteenth century—the ethics of Paley, the psychology of Hartley and Priestley—a school of thought which survived in the Benthamite development—took its death-blow from the new philosophy. In its place came a sense of largeness, distance and mystery, passionate feeling that sometimes passed the bounds of reason, fervid declamation sometimes perilously near to mere rhetoric; recognition of the infinite and eternal as part of human nature, and a love of seeing things "looming through a haze" The good side was its vindication of man's spiritual nature and kinship to the divine, the bad was a disposition to rest content with phrases, a preference of shadowy outline to well-defined fact Both sides derived largely from the teaching of Coleridge The altitudes which he loved were too giddy for most disciples, the thin air he breathed insufficient to give them oxygen Much of the formlessness and want of precision in modern English thought, as well as much of its depth and fervour and consciousness of immensity, seem traceable directly to Coleridge

From Kant, and still more from Schelling, Coleridge borrowed much of his framework But he built also on the labours of early English writers —as well as on the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and the Neoplatonist philosophers — and delighted to clothe his thought in Elizabethan or Caroline garb. It would be ridiculous to attempt giving a summary

Matter and manner

of his system, that system which was to be expounded in the long-dreamed-of *opus magnum*, and which his most devoted pupil vainly seeks to weave into an ordered whole. Enough to say that Coleridge, beginning as Unitarian and Hartleyan Associationist, ended on the loftiest heights of Transcendentalism, and found faith in the Trinity less a theological pronouncement than a philosophical necessity. How he reached his conclusions, how he pressed Kant's antinomies into the service of religious philosophy, and reconciled Subject and Object in one ineffable unity, how intuition was called in to supplement the deficiencies of our reasoning faculty, and *credo ideoque intelligo* declared man's noblest attitude—these are things too hard for the mere literary historian to recount The splendour of Coleridge's style at its best is more to our purpose Purple passages from the *Friend* and *Biographia Literaria* reach the highest summits of philosophical rhetoric The veriest agnostic, though too cautious to accept his premisses, and too wary to set foot in the mazes of his metaphysic, cannot but hold his breath as the interminable majestic periods roll on, and feel fain to say, Thou persuadest me to be a mystic!

Effect of his teaching

The influence of Coleridge is not to be counted by names of disciples He left no successor, founded no direct school. But his thought passed into the very heart of his age. The heart, even more than the intellect, of the rising generation became Coleridgean From him comes most that is strong in modern idealism; from him much that is weak in our philosophy and religion. The banalities

of the pulpit derive from him, as well as its freedom. The common division between faith and knowledge, Reason and Understanding, the intellect and the heart—division exemplified even by Tennyson when he tells how

> "A warmth within the breast would melt
> The freezing reason's colder part,
> And like a man in wrath the heart
> Stood up and answer'd, *I have felt*"—

this dangerous division comes direct from Coleridge. Dangerous indeed! For the soul of man is not built in water-tight compartments, like Faraday's knowledge, and if one faculty can mislead we have no security that another may not. Coleridge himself knew and admitted this, but he expressed his view with perilous latitude, and it has been seized and pressed beyond what he would have consented to allow. But this is merely one instance of how his seductive speculation tinged and coloured the thought of his age, so that many a writer or preacher, innocent of all acquaintance with Coleridge's philosophy at first hand, dwells on and disseminates views which, if not his in their fulness, are drawn from ideas on which Coleridge loved to dwell, and which he did not always succeed in expressing so guardedly as to prevent a not unnatural misconception.

It may be gathered from the foregoing that Coleridge's influence was even more potent in the realm of applied than in that of pure philosophy. Whether this be true or not, it is at least certain that we cannot point to any immediate dis-

Pupils of Coleridge

ciples in the latter region His influence was enormous, but it was general and formative rather than directly didactic. Perhaps in philosophy the nearest approach to a successor was Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-72), who again might be considered rather theologian than philosopher Yet as Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge, as a strenuous opponent of Mansel, and as author of *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy* (1850 *seq*), he may come here rather than in the last division of this chapter. It was under Coleridge's influence that Maurice quitted Unitarian views and literary work—he had written a novel *Eustace Conway* (1834), and for some time edited the *Athenæum*—to take orders in the Church of England. Maurice was a prominent figure of his day, a friend and guide to men like Charles Kingsley and Tom Hughes, a leader in social questions, a prolific writer, and, some would say, an influential thinker, but in philosophy proper his work can hardly be held important. More valuable, in pure philosophy at least, has been the work of his year-mate Rev. James Martineau (born 1805), at one time Professor of Philosophy in Manchester New College, of whom it can here be said only that his books reveal one of the most massive intellects of his time With these may be mentioned William Archer Butler (1814-48), whose short life barely allowed him to justify his election as Professor of Moral Philosophy at Trinity College, Dublin, by beginning an admirable series of *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy* (published 1856), and John Daniel Morell (1816-91), author of a useful History

of Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century (1846). But the connection of these last with Coleridge, it must be confessed, is somewhat remote.

Scottish School

In the case of the "Scottish School" no such difficulty presents itself We here find a regular progression, the torch handed on from bearer to bearer Dugald Stewart (1753-1828) and Thomas Brown (1778-1820) both come into our period, though perhaps more properly belonging to the generation before. From 1810 to 1820 they were joint-professors in Edinburgh Stewart's accomplished teaching had done much to create the Edinburgh school of thought, he wrote the metaphysical "Dissertation" corresponding to that on Ethics by Mackintosh, and so late as 1828 published his *Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers* Brown aided by lectures of remarkable subtlety, dealing mainly with psychological questions, on a more or less Hartleyan basis His early death robbed philosophy of a brilliant intellect Slightly junior to him was Dr John Abercrombie (1781-1844), a medical man whose *Enquiry concerning the Intellectual Powers* (1830) and *Philosophy of the Moral Feelings* (1833) were considerable contributions from one partly an outsider. These writers represent the early or upward progress of the school to which they belong, a progress which culminates in the teacher next to be named.

Sir William Hamilton (1788-1856) was a true leader of thought. Born of good family, he studied

at Oxford, astounding the examiners there by "professing" the whole works of Aristotle for his degree — a venture somewhat less dangerous then than it would probably be now. Called to the Scottish bar, he scarcely attempted practice, devoting himself instead to prodigious reading, especially among the Schoolmen and the then hardly known philosophers of Germany. In 1820 the death of Brown and resignation of Stewart vacated the chair of Moral Philosophy; but the electors preferred to Hamilton his friend and fellow-Oxonian Wilson ("Christopher North"), mentioned earlier in this volume as a literary man, but who certainly was not Hamilton's equal as a thinker. Hamilton, however (who next year obtained a minor chair, that of History), bore no grudge, and was frequently seen among "the Professor's" audience, vigorously applauding his fervid declamation. Not till 1836 did Hamilton find his place, by obtaining the still more suitable Chair of Logic and Metaphysics For eighteen years he lectured, drawing round him yearly increasing numbers of enthusiastic disciples Accounts given of his class remind us of the days of Abelard or the Revival of Learning. Prizes were given by vote, essays and disputations went on as in a University of the Middle Ages. Old and young, cleric and layman, student and man of the world, all flocked to the great instructor Death came after a paralytic stroke, followed by a period of uncertain health, but removed him when still in the zenith of his fame, and except for bodily weakness still master of his powers.

Hamilton

Hamilton's greatest work was done orally He spent immense time and labour on his edition of Reid's Works (1846; enlarged later), which, with magazine articles collected as *Discussions* (1852), and the posthumously edited *Lectures*, exhausts his literary output This is not the place to discuss his famous doctrine of the "Unconditioned" Suffice it to say that, claiming to start from Reid as originator of his school, and finding in that writer's formula of "common-sense" a meaning which it is pretty safe to say was never intended, Hamilton finished by rearing on this humble basis an edifice of stateliest proportions, obviously intended to sustain comparison with the master-building of Kant himself. Whether the structure is top-heavy, let philosophical critics say It is certainly expressed (to drop metaphor) in terminology the most uncouth conceivable. Such terminology may be necessary, metaphysic need not obey the canons of *belles lettres* But Hamilton's language does not seem quite to reach its end It has the crabbedness of Aristotle without its clearness If a special vocabulary is to be employed, making a page of metaphysics read almost like a page of Euclid, we might at least expect geometrical lucidity and proportion. That these results were not obtained, the disputes between his disciples as to actual meaning, the complaints of antagonists like John Stuart Mill, seem sufficiently to establish

Style and method.

Yet there is fascination in the very stiffness and obscurity of his style. He seems dealing with

matters hardly to be expressed in plain words, grappling with ideas almost more than mortal. The secret of the universe seems on the point of being expounded, hearers in his class no doubt felt that it was being actually laid bare One masters the technical terms, eager to apprehend his exact meaning Then the profuse quotations suggest literary omniscience Proclus and Plotinus, Averroes and Avicenna, are as familiar as Plato and Aristotle Ancient and modern, prose-writer or poet, nothing seems hid from him But his special delight is to unearth from some obscure Schoolman a sentence which sums up the very pith and marrow of his own speculation, or a verse so apposite that one half suspects it made up by the writer himself—

Impression produced

> "At illa Mens, vah! qualis est,
> Conspecta cui stant omnia
> In singulis quæ perspicit
> Quæcunque sunt in singulis,
> Et singulorum singulis"

Hamilton's teaching raised the "Scottish School" to highest fame Learners came from all parts of the country His disciples were many and brilliant. James Frederick Ferrier (1808-64), one of the most brilliant of all, wrote much for *Blackwood*, reproduced exactly the earlier stages of Hamilton's own life, but ended by becoming Professor of Moral Philosophy at St Andrews. His *Institutes of Metaphysic* (1854) reveal a thinker of *verve* and subtlety, who did not fear to stateidealism in its boldest terms, and sought to define these with geometrical

Followers of Hamilton

exactness. He was a nephew of the novelist named in last chapter James M'Cosh (1811-94) carried his master's teaching to Ireland and America, and is well known by his *Examination of Mill* and many other works Henry Longueville Mansel (1820-71), afterwards Dean of St Paul's, combined sparkling wit with profound thought His assertion of the relativity of our knowledge of the Creator gave offence to many beside the orthodox, and, as we have seen, drew on him the strictures of J. S. Mill Mansel's edition of "Aldrich" (1849), his *Prolegomena Logica* (1851), and his *Metaphysics* article in the eighth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—with several later books, including the famous *Bampton Lectures* for 1858—are still familiar to the student Of Alexander Campbell Fraser (born 1819), successor to Hamilton's chair, and editor of Berkeley's works; Thomas Spencer Baynes (1823-87), Professor of Logic at St Andrews, John Veitch (1829-94), poet and philosopher, biographer of Hamilton, and co-editor with Mansel of his *Lectures*, and Henry Calderwood (1830-97), lately Professor of Moral Philosophy in Edinburgh University, it were improper here to speak Their names will show how Hamilton's seed fell into fruitful soil, and came up in many forms even to our own day

Influence of this school

Writers of the "Scottish School" introduced a robuster note into contemporary thought. The mysticism of Coleridge, the nerveless grasp and illusory reasoning of many of his followers, found no favour in their eyes But they

joined hands against the common enemy, and reinforced the Highgate contingent with fighting men of proved mettle. Like the Coleridgeans, they were great students of German, which gradually became the armoury from which philosophical weapons were mainly borrowed This habit of drawing freely from German sources ranks as the main feature of the time, and continues so even till now The blood-relationship between Teutonic thought and our own is a fact of very great moment, and has survived many satirical attacks, and much natural preference for the perspicuity and elegance of French writers. In the commonweal of literary Europe, racial distinctions should have no place But we cannot alter facts, and the one just mentioned has to be fairly reckoned with.

Semi philosophical writers

Before leaving philosophy, mention may be made of some authors whose books, though not precisely philosophical, had large influence on speculative thought. Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834) deserves note, not for his much-decried *Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798), which belongs to an older generation, but for his much later *Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent* (1815) and *Principles of Political Economy* (1820). Robert Owen (1771-1858) attracted much attention by his *New View of Society* (1813) and his socialistic experiments, at a time when the meaning of this last word was hardly understood. David Ricardo (1772-1823) corresponded with and followed up the ideas of Malthus, and published in 1817 his *Principles of Political*

Economy and Taxation, a work that may be considered the starting-point of the "Dismal Science" in its existing form George Combe (1788-1858), a follower of Gall, or rather of Spurzheim, introduced to the English public the so-called science of Phrenology, and also wrote a book of considerable importance named *The Constitution of Man* (1828)

Importance of theology

Theology, "queen of the sciences," has had hard allowance during this Century Often declared to have no existence, it is at best mentioned with apology, and even its votaries seek to dissimulate a passion which used to be matter of pride. Like "dogma," it has passed from being a title of honour to being a term—shall we say?—of contempt. With its abstruser reaches, its more scholastic concepts and divisions, these pages have of course no concern. But as theology in its broader sense powerfully influences the thought of an age, as it directly affects the minds, and therefore the writings, of men whatever their creed, no apology is made for devoting space to it here This is the more necessary because the theological movements of our period were numerous and important, and reacted in marked fashion on most forms of literature. Some account of these, or rather of the writings to which they gave birth, will fitly conclude this chapter.

A recent book, "Collections and Recollections," draws a sombre picture of the state of religion and morals in England at the end of last Century Students of that epoch know that the colours are

not laid on too darkly. It was a time of low aims, and debased standards of life. Things had somewhat improved by the time our period begins. At Court and in high life amelioration might lag, but in the middle-class it was already conspicuous. To ascribe a change of so general a kind to theology may seem whimsical and far-fetched. Yet there can be little doubt that this movement, coming as it did from the great mass of the nation rather than from any special leaders, was mainly due to the Evangelical Revival. No doubt that cause itself was conditioned by facts which lay deeper than any strata of popular religion. But the historian must be content to deal with phenomena. The evident circumstances in this case, which no amount of special pleading can get over, are that a reaction toward greater purity of life and manners synchronised with a quickening of the popular conscience, and that this took the form of what is called Evangelicalism. The names of Hannah More, William Wilberforce, Charles Simeon, Robert Hall, John Foster, and Legh Richmond—not to mention the poetry of Cowper and the purely theological works of John Newton and others—are proof sufficient that this movement existed, and that it reflected itself in literature, with quite appreciable result, though rather before the date we have now under view.

Evangelical revival

It is interesting to remember that all the great men about to be named were brought up under Evangelical influence. That influence moulded their most susceptible years. But, as modern ideas crept in, a division of impulse made itself felt. The

younger men tended to adopt one or other of two conflicting lines of thought, which are known respectively as the Broad Church and High Church views. So much has been written about each of these—the historical development of each will be so familiar to all readers—that it seems better here not to class writers separately, but as before to follow chronological order The sequence and contemporaneity of the two schools, sometimes forgotten when they are treated separately, will thus be kept in sight And after all it is with the men as men, or rather as writers, that we are concerned, more than with their place in a theological party

Broad Church and High Church

John Keble (1792-1866) has been previously mentioned as a poet. His most valuable literary work was either poetry or criticism of poetry. But as an influencer of others he must come in here, since to his initiative the "High Church" movement was due. First at Oxford, then at Hursley, he gathered round him a band of devoted disciples, who vainly sought to force him into a more prominent position. His wise counsel, his steadfast moderation, kept the party together in its darkest hour, and to the end he retained his position as chief authority. From where he himself drew his ideas, which exercised so potent and transforming an effect, it were hopeless to consider here, beyond noting the influence of the Romantic Poets on his own sweet but restricted poetical gift. As a prose writer he is remembered mainly by his Sermons, of which that on

Keble

National Apostacy (1833) may be taken as one of the most striking both in itself and for its results

Augustus William Hare (1792-1834) is the next on our list. Oxonian and country rector, he published little but sermons, except that he co-operated with his brother Julius in a book which made much stir, *Guesses at Truth* (1827), which appeared without the writers' names This book, largely following Coleridge's lead, did much to familiarise English readers with German criticism, and particularly with broader views of Biblical inspiration. He himself, his wife Maria Leycester, and the other members of a remarkable family, are painted for us in the numerous writings of the later Augustus Hare (born 1834), the well-known biographer and travel-writer of our own day

Augustus Hare

Between the brothers Hare comes Renn Dickson Hampden (1793-1868), afterwards Bishop of Hereford Oxonian too, his "Bampton Lectures" of 1832, his election to the headship of St Mary Hall and to the chairs of Moral Philosophy and Divinity, but above all his nomination as Bishop, formed the occasion of furious protests by the High Church party. Besides his Bampton Lectures, he was author of several books on divinity and philosophy, none of which need now be particularised

Hampden

Julius Charles Hare (1795-1855) was a more forceful writer than his brother. Educated at Cambridge, he became Rector of Hurstmonceaux and afterwards Archdeacon of Lewes; and he married a sister of Frederick Maurice.

Julius Hare

After translating Fouqué's *Sintram* (1820), and with his brother writing *Guesses at Truth* (1827), he co-operated with Thirlwall in translating Niebuhr (1828 *seq*), and published in 1829 his own *Vindication of Niebuhr's History* A recognised party leader, his later publications were mainly Sermons or "Charges,' the latter especially being influential on his time. But he also wrote a *Life* (1848) of his curate Sterling, which had a curious fate. As John Sterling (1806-43), though a bright and winsome personality, hardly requires separate mention as a writer in these pages, it may be sufficient to name him here, and to note the curious fact that he wrote a novel called *Connigsby* and a tragedy called *Strafford*, anticipating in each case better known performances Sterling's widened views clashed with even Hare's eclecticism, and the *Life* written by Hare dwelt so much on this one aspect of Sterling's work that Carlyle was moved to write that infinitely more remarkable *Life of Sterling* (1851) which will immortalise the short-lived subject, and in connection with which, it is not improbable, Julius Hare himself will be chiefly remembered

Next in order should be named Arnold and Thirlwall, already dealt with under the head of History; and Walter Farquhar Hook (1798-1875), a non-papal High-Churchman, author of a *Church Dictionary* (1842) and other works of ecclesiastical biography. Then we come to Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-82) Of good family, and Oxford training, Pusey was through life a University

Pusey

magnate, residing there except during two years of early study in Germany It is curious to think that Pusey's début was made as expounder of German theology, and that he incurred suspicion of undue laxity in his own opinions To the last he retained his interest in this subject, but it need hardly be said that he had no sympathy with "Rationalism," to a study of which his earliest publication was devoted In Keble he found a friend and adviser It was at the latter's suggestion that the famous "Tracts for the Times" were begun (in 1833), a venture of which Pusey and Newman were chief supporters Pusey, by this time Regius Professor of Hebrew, played a prominent part in the discussions which followed "The great man," as Newman loved to call him, was a tower of strength, both for learning and for sobriety of judgment, and it was not aptly that the school, even before Newman's secession, became known as Puseyite. Besides the Tracts, Pusey edited the *Oxford Library of the Fathers* (begun 1836), translating for it *Augustine's Confessions* and other works. Tract 90 was condemned in 1841, in 1843 Pusey was suspended from preaching before the University, and in 1845 Newman joined the Church of Rome Under these and other blows the party staggered, but Keble and Pusey rallied and kept them together. In later days Pusey became prosecutor instead of prosecuted. The University Commission of 1852 was a sore blow, the Gorham judgment and the rationalistic teaching of Jowett and others wounded him to the quick. But he remained faithful to the Church of England,

defending what he deemed her faith by speech and writing, restraining as far as possible the excesses of his own followers, while sternly refusing any compromise with the enemy. In the evening of life his public work was chiefly literary, while in private he was the trusted confidant and father-confessor to younger men His private life was saintly, even beyond the verge of asceticism. Eleven years of married life left him a widower for his remaining days Penance and mortification were familiar to him, and his charity was munificent. His best work was done as party leader, but his writings ranged from a *Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts* (1835) to a *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* (1860-77) A pamphlet on *Collegiate and Professorial Teaching* (1854) is valuable from an academic standpoint Gentle and affectionate by nature, Pusey outlived the harshness of controversy, and has left perhaps the purest reputation of any one connected with the Oxford Movement But ecclesiastical conflict made great inroad on his time for work, and he has bequeathed less literary record than many men of inferior ability

Newman

John Henry Newman (1801-90), a few months Pusey's junior, was a brother-fellow at Oriel Early seeking clerical work, he became vicar of St Mary's, published his book on the *Arians* (1833), and wrote several hymns printed in *Lyra Apostolica* (1834). "*Lead, kindly light!*" in particular, was composed during a voyage in the Mediterranean *Tracts for the Times* revealed his full power, and made him in

some respects the real leader of the Tractarian movement Against Rome he protested vigorously, while vindicating the catholicity of the Anglican Church But the condemnation of Tract 90 in 1841 was followed by the resignation of his charge in 1843, and in 1845 he was received into the Church of Rome. Beyond the *Tracts* and successive volumes of very fine sermons, he had as yet published little For the next few years not much was heard of him, but *Anglican Difficulties* (1850) and *Catholicism in England* (1851) showed that his pen retained its old power An incautious sentence of Charles Kingsley's provoked the masterly *Apologia pro vita sua* (1864), which caused a reaction of opinion in his favour All these years he worked quietly at Birmingham, in the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, but about 1870 he took a prominent part against Manning and the Ultramontanes. In spite of this he received the cardinal's hat in 1879, and for some ten years more lived in high honour, once at least revisiting Oxford after so long absence. Besides books mentioned, he wrote many others, including two historical romances, a poem called *The Dream of Gerontius* (1865), a philosophic treatise entitled *The Grammar of Assent* (1870), and many volumes of sermons and lectures All show the same finished style, clearness of thought, subtlety of argument, and vigour of conception and handling

Newman was not only the greatest of the Tractarian writers, but one of the very greatest writers of his time. Perhaps Carlyle alone could be set up against him as a master of English prose. Comparison be-

tween the two is impossible, and no one would claim for Newman the titanic force of Carlyle's volcanic utterance, any more than they would claim for Carlyle the silver beauty of Newman's writing. As a master of English Newman is superb. While Carlyle's effects are obtained by means the most brutal and violent, Newman's are reached by an art which conceals art. He never poses, never mouths, never stoops to maltreat the Queen's English. If there be a fault, it is the super-subtle delicacy of his ratiocinative process, but limpid clearness of style goes far to redeem this. With his merits as a theologian we have fortunately nothing to do, as a stylist his place is among the highest. He may not impress the popular ear, for he seldom indulges in deliberate fine writing. He regards the end of an argument, not the means, and must be judged of as a whole, not by isolated passages. Indeed, his influence as a writer has not been commensurate with his ability. The man Newman is better known than the author. His books may not have enough solid matter in them to withstand the attack of oblivion. But so far as manner goes, so far as pure style, untouched by garish excess or gaudiness of description, can make a writer immortal, Newman is secure of immortality.

His literary power

One year younger than Newman was Nicholas Patrick Wiseman (1802-65), afterwards Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, who wrote many theological books, founded the *Dublin Review* (1836), and was the occasion of a manifestation of anti-papal feeling on his assuming the title conferred

Minor authors

by the Head of his Church Richard Hurrell Froude (1803-36), another fellow of Oriel, was a close friend of Newman's, and wrote one or two of the *Tracts*, but his early death extinguished a genius which may have been equal to that of his brother the historian John Kitto (1804-54) was a popular writer of religious books, such as the *Pictorial Bible* (1838) and *Pictorial History of Palestine* (1840), and edited the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (1848 *seq.*), published by Charles Knight. He had the misfortune to be stone-deaf, and took no part in theological controversy

Bishop Wilberforce

Samuel Wilberforce (1805-73), son of the eminent Evangelical, devoted his youth to clerical work, having no university connection from the time he finished his undergraduate career at Oxford till he became Bishop of the diocese Meantime he had been curate, rector, rural dean, archdeacon, canon (of Winchester), court chaplain, and Dean of Westminster. This wide experience gave him great knowledge of affairs and strong parochial interests, and administration was his best point Skilful, astute, even "saponaceous" in manner, the Bishop of Oxford has been painted by many hands, and given rise to many literary bon-mots. His encounters with Lord Westbury have become historical, while the "Bishop" in *Lothair* will probably preserve his memory longest Wilberforce maintained close relations with the Tractarian school, but *ab extra* rather than from within As a writer he did little, the *Life and Journals of Henry Martyn* (1837), stories called *Agathos* (1839) and *Rocky Island* (1840), with a *History of the*

American Church (1844) and his share in writing his father's *Life*, being his chief contributions. But he influenced men who wrote, and his bright wit kept up a family tradition He was killed by a fall from his horse, not long after being promoted to the see of Winchester.

Manning, and others

The year 1805 gave birth to several other theological writers. But Maurice and Dr Martineau have been mentioned already, and there remains but to name Francis William Newman, brother of the Cardinal (1805-97). Of him it can here be said only that the spirit of the age drove him on an opposite course from his brother's, and that he wrote *The Soul* (1849) and *Phases of Faith* (1853), works of ultra-liberal tone One year junior was Henry Rogers (1806-77), congregational minister, who controversially attacked Newman's just-mentioned books, and whose *Eclipse of Faith* (1852) was long deemed a model of vigorous polemic. And then we come to Henry Edward Manning (1808-92), another of the Oxford party Fellow of Merton and contributor to *Tracts for the Times*, friend of Newman and related by marriage to Wilberforce, Manning joined the Church of Rome in 1851, and speedily rose there to high office Siding with the Ultramontane party, he became estranged from Newman, succeeded Wiseman at Westminster in 1865, supported strongly the Infallibility decree in 1870, and was made a cardinal in 1875. Later he laboured much on social questions, and made an impressive and honoured figure in London society He wrote many sermons and theo-

logical tractates, and the Anglican pulpit sustained a severe loss when he left it.

Henry Alford (1810-71), a Cantab, afterwards Dean of Canterbury, was pre-eminently a type of the modern literary clergyman. Besides popular hymns and verses, he wrote magazine articles innumerable, and edited the *Contemporary Review*, but is best known by his notes to the Greek Testament (first volume, 1844) Edward Harold Browne (1811-91), Divinity Professor at Cambridge, Bishop of Ely and (after Wilberforce) of Winchester, wrote many non-party treatises, notably one on the Thirty-nine Articles (1850). William George Ward (1812-82), one of the most interesting figures in the Oxford Movement, brilliant, humorous, with a Puck-like love of stirring up difficult questions, wrote one famous book, the *Ideal of a Christian Church* (1844), which cost him his Fellowship at Balliol and his University career Received into the Roman Church, he edited for some time the *Dublin Review*, lived latterly on his estate in the Isle of Wight, and was commemorated in a sonnet by his attached friend Lord Tennyson

Effects on literature

The importance to literature of this troubled time of wrangling and contention must excuse disproportionate length of recital It will be seen how large a place in men's thoughts at this stage was taken by theological controversy. Theology in the 'Thirties, Geology in the 'Forties, were bugbears to honest souls; and the former swallowed up even the latter, developing into a general unsettling of men's minds. That such a process should

leave no mark on literature would be indeed improbable Accordingly, we find theological ideas and passwords becoming current coin in popular writing to a degree unparalleled even in times of storm like the Reformation Hence the necessity of sketching, however briefly, the foregoing lives, hence the value to a literary student of some knowledge of their outlines The Tractarian and Broad Church movements in the Church of England, regarded from this point of view, assume the dignity and the interest of national events

Scottish divinity

While the life of the Church of England was thus distracted and troubled, that of the Church of Scotland was a prey to still more internecine dissension, culminating in the "Disruption" of 1843. During years of conflict which preceded that event, abstrusest questions of theology had been discussed *coram populo* by some of the acutest intellects in the kingdom. In Scotland yet more universally than in England theological discussion swayed men's hearts and minds. "A free Church in a free State," as Montalembert and Cavour afterwards phrased it, appealed to memories of the past as to resentment of state interference in the present, and it may safely be said that the main engrossment of Scottish literature during this latter portion of our period was theological and polemical.

The leader in this prolonged controversy was Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847). Competent critics have spoken of Chalmers in terms of almost idolising admiration.

It is difficult to realise this impression now As a pulpit or platform orator he was clearly very great. But his writings, for example his "Bridgewater Treatise" (cf *ante*), with a title too long to quote, strike one as containing somewhat more of turgid rhetoric than of real eloquence Possibly this is not unusual with the writing of orators. Chalmers was also a great statesman—too great for comprehension by the Queen's ill-advised advisers—profoundly interested in economic and social problems, and deviser of that Sustentation Fund, or general pooling of stipends, which did so much to ensure financial success to the new organisation. He died only four years after the exodus of 1843, labouring to the last both at Church affairs and at his posthumously published *Institutes of Theology*

Chalmers

The captains of the "Free" Church—some younger leaders of the still "Established" section which remained in possession of the temporalities—with one or two representatives of other bodies, cherishing a characteristically intense life of their own—gave to literature what time could be snatched from more laborious and responsible duties But, with the single exception of Hugh Miller (*ante*, p 150), it can scarcely be claimed that any of their publications, prior at least to 1850, demand attention on the ground of purely literary value.

His successors

The reader has now had put before him, so far as imperfect guidance would allow, materials for a rough sketch of how the Romantic Triumph affected the

literature of our own country We have traced its workings in poetry and in prose, in imaginative literature and didactic, in the pages of verse-writers and novelists, historians and men of science, philosophers and theologians Some attempt has been made to indicate how much English letters, in various departments, were affected by the operation of the same causes in other countries. What remains of this volume will be devoted to showing in more detail, within the limits of knowledge still more imperfect, how the Triumph of the Romantic Movement during the same half-century affected languages and literatures other than our own.

Conclusion

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN FRANCE.

ORIGIN OF ROMANTIC MOVEMENT—LITERATURE OF THE RESTORATION—WIDE DIFFUSION OF MOVEMENT — LAMARTINE'S FIRST VOLUME — CHÉNIER AND DELAVIGNE — BERANGER — TRANSLATIONS — PROSE WRITERS: LAMENNAIS, CONSTANT, COURIER — PROFESSIONAL REVIEWERS — UNIVERSITY LEADERS. VILLEMAIN, GUIZOT, COUSIN — DISCIPLES OF COUSIN—HISTORY. MICHAUD, BARANTE, SISMONDI, THIERRY, MICHELET, THIERS — SOCIALISTIC SCHOOL — NATURAL SCIENCE — VICTOR HUGO — "HERNANI" — ENGLISH ACTORS IN PARIS — REVOLUTION IN VERSE — FREEDOM AND SONORITY — CHIEF EARLY WRITINGS — CHARACTER OF HIS WORK — OTHER ROMANTICS — VIGNY — POET AND NOVELIST — SAINTE BEUVE — MUSSET — WORK AND LIMITATIONS — GAUTIER — STRENGTH OF HIS WORK — BEGINNINGS OF CHANGE — LAMARTINE — HIS REAL IMPORTANCE — MINOR VERSE — STENDHAL — FICTION. BALZAC — HIS LIFE — HIS WORKS — THEIR SUBJECT — HIS METHOD — AIMS AND RESULTS — DUMAS — CRITICISM OF DUMAS — HIS RIGHTFUL PLACE — GEORGE SAND — CHARACTERISATION OF HER WORK — STYLE AND SHORTCOMINGS — MÉRIMÉE — EUGÈNE SUE — JANIN — BERNARD — KARR — SUMMARY: TRANSITION TO DRAMA — BRIEF VOGUE OF ROMANTIC DRAMA — INHERENT DRAWBACKS — RIVAL DRAMATISTS — COMEDY SCRIBE — OTHER WRITERS OF COMEDY — WRITERS OF CRITICISM — JOUBERT, AND OTHERS — PUBLICISTS — PROUDHON — LOUIS BLANC — LACORDAIRE — MONTALEMBERT — THE GUERINS — OZANAM — WOMEN-WRITERS — LATER HISTORIANS — TOCQUEVILLE — COMTE — HIS SYSTEM — HIS GREAT WORK — ITS ABIDING VALUE — CONCLUSION — INFLUENCE OF FRENCH WRITERS — CAUSES OF GRATITUDE — PASSAGE TO GERMANY.

FRANCE, centre and focus of the revolutionary spirit

in Europe, was late in applying herself to literary rebellion[1] Her chief energies had other outlet The Terror with its scenes of carnage, the lurid stage-play of Napoleon's wars, left men little time or wish to cultivate letters Yet literary stirrings and strivings existed even during those times of bloodshed Earlier volumes of this series must tell how the reaction against Classicism began, how the impulse given by Rousseau shaped the romance of Saint-Pierre and the meditation of Chateaubriand, while new scenes and new modes of thought were introduced to French readers by the descriptions of Madame de Stael. Led by dangerous destiny to the van of international conflict, France became perforce familiarised with foreign names and habits of speech England and Germany, in particular, were seen to possess literatures unlike those of Latin races, yet deserving study The great Emperor slept with "Ossian" under his pillow Shakespeare and Goethe found students among the readers of Corneille and Racine Before the end of the First Empire, the literary soil of France had been deeply

Origin of Romantic Movement

[1] Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la langue et la littérature française* vol. VII (Paris, 1899) Brunetière, *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1898, English translation same year) Lanson *Histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1896). Demogeot, *the same* (Paris, 1892) Charpentier, *La littérature française au dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris, 1875) Gautier, *Histoire du romantisme* (Paris, 1895) Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, 3 vols (Paris, 1847, new edition, 1855), *Portraits littéraires*, 3 vols (Paris, 1862-64) Maxime du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1882-83) *Grands écrivains français* (Hachette et Cie., 1886, *seq*) Faguet, *Études littéraires* (Paris, 1898).

tilled by new forces, and was ready to burst forth in strange forms of harvest. But it was not till after, in 1815, Buonaparte gave way to the Bourbons, that the Romantic Revolt in France can be said to have become triumphant

Literature of the Restoration

We in England have a literature of the Restoration It is one in which few of us take much pride or pleasure But in French history the name denotes a period of magnificent vitality, during which all that is most living in the France of to-day took shape and substance To the "Restauration" French writers of this Century look back as to a Golden Age All was bright, and fresh, and new Infinite possibilities seemed opening. History, philosophy, political writing and teaching breathed the spirit of poetry, were full of the new fiery wine As to verse itself, the time had clearly come to rejuvenate, to transform it, to bid farewell and defiance to old creeds and critics In reading what French writers of all schools say of this epoch, we continually remember the words in which Wordsworth describes his own and France's revolutionary morning thirty years earlier—

> "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
> But to be young was very heaven"

Wide diffusion of movement

Not in poetry alone, by any means, are the first victories of the new school to be traced. France had much to learn, and plain prose suited best the task of discussion and prelection. Pamphlets and lectures and university courses—the class-rooms of the Sorbonne, the columns of *Les Débats*

and *Le Globe*—these too were places where the new doctrine flourished, pulpits whence the Romantic gospel was preached The intellectual life of France, during the years following 1815 and leading up to 1830, flowed in many different channels, and filled them all with abounding vigour Our survey of this period, therefore, must not be confined to one department at a time, but embrace in bird's-eye view all the varied literary activities which bore witness to a new departure Poetry sounded the onset, so with poetry our narrative begins. But ere long we shall find our gaze wandering to other and wider fields.

Lamartine's first volume

The *Méditations* of Lamartine were published in 1820. Since the appearance of Chateaubriand, no first work of any writer made so profound an impression Reared in the stormy days of the Empire, Alphonse-Marie-Louis Prat de Lamartine (1790-1869) drank deep of the spirit of battle and revolution, yet combined it with a wistful regard for the sanctities of authority and tradition. He is not himself wholly iconoclast, nor even wholly Romantic But he shows the way to others, who will go far. Meantime, his own verses, tender, pathetic, elemental, reveal new points of unfamiliar inspiration The old undying subjects—Love, Death, Nature—are treated from new standpoints, sung to new tunes. The author tells us how he took his manuscript to Didot, publisher and arbiter of letters, and received an adverse verdict. Your verses, he was told, are

melodious, but crude, they do not resemble anything which is accepted or sought after by our poets; one knows not whence you have taken your language, your ideas, your images Undismayed, the young poet committed his work to the press, and was rewarded by the immediate and almost unanimous applause of his readers What freshness, what refinement, what "ethereal aspiration," what enchanting and musical melancholy ' Young France went wild over the new writer. Critics of standing might say what they pleased, here was something unhackneyed, something suited to the new world opening all around Lamartine's later lifework will engage us again At present it is enough to note these *Méditations* of 1820 as sounding for the first time clearly the Romance note in France, opening the gates through which a whole army would before long seek to pass.

Chénier and Delavigne.

Other verse-writers may be noted, less clearly preluding the Romantic strain, yet interesting both in themselves and in their relation to the change inaugurated by Lamartine The poems of André-Marie de Chénier (1762-94) belong to a previous generation. But the posthumous publication of his collected works in 1820 introduced him for the first time to most readers, and his neo-Classicism, of a somewhat Byzantine type, brought at least a new breath into French poetical atmosphere Entirely of this age, on the other hand, was Casimir Delavigne (1793-1843), who became known as early as 1817. Less original than his great contemporaries soon to be named, he was also

less alive to the humanising influences of Peace and the Restoration.

> "Enfant, j'aimais la France aimer la France alors,
> C'était détester l'Angleterre"

Not this the spirit to draw sustenance from the literature of other nations. Yet Delavigne's work is interesting in its way. As a lyrist of somewhat wooden calibre, as a playwright of respectable vigour, he fills his own place in the literature of his time. His chief works, to which we need not again return, are *Les vêpres siciliennes* (1819), *Le paria* (1821), *Les messéniennes* (1827), *Marino Faliero* (1829), *Louis XI* (1832), *Don Juan d'Autriche* (1835), *La fille du Cid* (1840), with two early comedies, *Les comédiens* (1820) and *L'école des vieillards* (1823). Delavigne is often abused as a mere hanger-on of the Romantics, who pillaged their ideas and copied their forms. But he seems rather an experimenter before them, less successful, and doomed to absorption in their brilliance. He wrote much in *Le lycée français*, an avant-courier showing semi-Romantic twilight before the dawn, started in 1819 by the short-lived Charles Loyson (1791-1820), himself the author of *Épîtres et élégies* (1819) whose verse and whose ideas approximate with some closeness to those of Lamartine.

A more noteworthy writer, though in a narrow field, is Pierre-Jean de Béranger (1780-1857). The songs of Béranger (the aristocratic prefix was a mere assumption) are known by name to all readers. The first appeared in 1815, the

Béranger

last (*Dernières chansons*) in the year of his death. Their easy if rather prosaic cadence, their happy-go-lucky epicureanism, the writer's somewhat *fade* and vulgar sentiment, his paganism and his Buonapartism; the naïveté and amusement of his careless thoughts on life and love, are familiar to most of us, and have been happily reproduced in one or two cases by Thackeray. The bourgeois Horace of Paris, it cannot be held that either his art or his inspiration greatly widened the outlook of French poetry. He is rather a "prose-man writing in verse," and his merit is to picture faithfully the petty life of the Parisian cockney during the period we are considering Yet he worked loyally according to his lights, and tried to correct his own want of education and accomplishment Comparing him with Burns, we see how limited is the nature of the man, how trivial his production. Neither high poetry nor high passion can for a moment find room with him In its own way, however,—limited, commonplace, tawdry often in conception and sometimes in execution,—a chanson of Béranger's retains a certain happiness and even music of its own, and combined with other influences to popularise the idea of more free and unconventional singing

Translations

These are names not without distinction. It remains true, however, that during the earlier years of our period more vivifying and vitalising influences worked in prose than in poetry. Even in verse, indeed, the many translations put forth were perhaps fully more formative than the original work. A series of *Chefs-d'œuvre des théâtres étrangers*

(1822-23), by various hands, gave *Hamlet*, *Faust*, and *Emilia Galotti* to French readers About the same time, Barante published a translation of the entire poetical works of Schiller, Constant and Rémusat reproduced the dramatic works of Goethe, Guizot and Pichot sent out their monumental rendering of the whole works of Shakespeare, based on the earlier labours of Letourneur. The international *rapprochement* was complete, no feeling of soreness seeming to be left, as after a later war The Corsican had fallen, but France still remained great and glorious A few old soldiers of the Empire, perhaps, still "detested England" and despised Prussia, but the predominant feeling, in politics as in letters, was one of courteous readiness to profit by mutual inter-relation

Prose writers—Lamennais

Turn we therefore now to consider the weighty output of prose which signalised the years 1815-30 Joseph-Marie de Maistre (1753-1821), and Louis-Gabriel-Amboise de Bonald (1754-1840), seem hardly to belong to these years Yet the publication of *Le pape* (1819) by the former, of *Les recherches philosophiques* (1818) by the latter, bring them within our view, as veterans and still leaders De Maistre, aristocratic, energetic, often paradoxical, wielding his pen like a weapon of offence, had long preached anti-Voltairean and anti-materialistic views of life and history[1] De Bonald, calmer, more

[1] His younger brother, Xavier de Maistre (1763-1852), wrote some delicate sketches of foreign life, also the *Voyage autour de ma chambre* (1791), quite a classic in its way, and one which inaugurated a fashion of its own

systematic, logician and thinker,—though far from his equal in regard of style,—had combated the doctrines of Rousseau and Montesquieu, declaring law, language, and society to be the work not of man but of God To these now added himself a younger champion, Hugues-Félicité-Robert de Lamennais (1783-1854) Born of that Breton stock which has given France so many of her leading thinkers, this young priest had lived near Dinan in his youth, written and been proscribed under the Empire, had fled to England during the Hundred Days, and now returned to Paris with the éclat of a sufferer His essay on Indifference in matters of Religion (1816) created a veritable furore Pushing further the doctrine of his great predecessors, he boldly declared against the right of private judgment, and claimed that the unity of society presupposes a unity of truth His after-history is a curious comment on this text He who denounced toleration, and execrated personal liberty of thought, was himself condemned by his ecclesiastical superiors The College he had founded, the periodical where he expressed his views, came both under the ban Going to Rome, he vainly pleaded his cause, and avenged his defeat by publishing *Les affaires de Rome* (1836), in which he broke loose from the authority of the Vatican, and entered a path which led ultimately to his resigning clericalism. At the time of which we write, however, he was still the trusted hero of the Ultramontanes, developing theories which de Maistre had laid down in *Le Pape* Though his *Defense de l'essai sur l'indifférence* (1821) caused

suspicion at Rome, while his *Progrès de la revolution* (1828) conceded the private liberty he had formerly denounced, there was as yet no sign of the fire about to burst forth in *Paroles d'un croyant* (1834), much less of the complete negation of authority which permeated the great work of his old age, the *Esquisse d'une philosophie* (1840-46) The combination of what we should call radicalism and high-churchism which de Lamennais taught his followers created a serious and energetic school, anticipating in some ways the English Tractarian Movement. With Comte on one side, Victor Hugo on the other, they had intimate relations The "Mennaisian School" must be ranked among the potent influences which shaped the thought and political philosophy of the years 1815-30 in France And the literary genius of its founder, inspiring his poetic flights and "apocalyptic" visions, threw the weight of that influence on the side of freedom and variety and independence in letters

Side by side with this ecclesiastical writer stood others of independent aim, but working in the same direction Benjamin Constant (Henri-Benjamin Constant de Rebecque, 1767-1830) was of Swiss birth though French stock, educated abroad in Germany, Oxford, and Edinburgh; had been exiled under the Empire, but made his peace with Napoleon before the end, and now came forward in the cause of freedom and constitutional government. After publishing in 1816 his own love-story—it is said —as a romance (*Adolphe*), he entered Parliament in

Constant

1819, where his oratorical powers secured for him the leadership of the Liberal Opposition In speeches, in pamphlets, in letters (his miscellaneous writings fill some dozen volumes), and later in an important work, *De la religion, &c* (5 vols, 1824-31), he poured forth a flood of stimulating thought, emancipated yet not anti-religious. The doctrinaires of last Century, he affirmed, despised Christianity because they failed to comprehend it The new Liberal school preferred construction to destruction As a Liberal leader, therefore, his influence made for independence, yet for reverence Speaker first and foremost, he is eminent also as a writer and polemist. Lately (1895), the publication of his *Journal intime* has completed the impression made by his *Letters*, his *Discourses*, his *Mélanges de littérature et de politique* And the result shows him, if somewhat erratic in his own personality, a strong and trusted leader in the cause of constitutional reform, and in literary affairs an enlarging and stimulating force

Courier.

Very different was the career of Paul-Louis Courier de Méré (1772-1825) A soldier in his youth, yet no admirer of his Emperor, a pamphleteer in later life, pouring equal scorn on Royalist institutions, while living peaceably under them on his country estate; devoted to the Classics, and translating them in a somewhat pedantic and "precious" manner, Courier is more remarkable for style than for elevation of thought or aim. His petty politics may be forgotten, his hatred of priests and kings, his abuse of Parliament (*Pétition aux deux chambres*, 1816),

of the Académie des Inscriptions (1819), of all that clashed with his narrow notions of what a renovated France should be But he survives in literature as satirist and stylist, revelling in archaisms, scornful of Eighteenth Century letters as of Nineteenth Century politics, looking back for his models to Greece and Rome and the great writers who lived under Louis Quatorze. In this way he, too, taught his contemporaries to despise whatever was merely formal and traditional. His death at fifty-two by the hand of an assassin, only four years after the appearance of one of his ablest productions (*Simple discours*, 1821), removed a brilliant writer in the fulness of his power His works were published in four volumes (Paris, 1834), with a biographical introduction by Armand Carrel, himself a soldier in the same cause, and destined two years later to an equally violent end

Professional reviewers

Claude-Charles Fauriel (1772-1844) is a name of less note, but suggests the literary critic by profession, a type less common at this period than it became later Scholar and Professor, Academician and writer of histories, an early student of mediæval and translator of Italian and German authors, his introductory prefaces did much to diffuse Romantic ideas. A specimen of these is the "Theory of dramatic art," prefixed to translations from Manzoni (1823), hotly attacking the Unities; of his longer works the *Histoire de la poesie provençale* (1846) is perhaps most important Sainte-Beuve has sketched Fauriel in *Portraits contemporains*. With him, somewhat later, may be compared Charles Magnin (1793-1862), still

more the occasional critic, his best work being done for the *Globe* and *Revue des deux mondes* *Origines du théâtre* (1838) and *Causeries et méditations* (1842) are collections respectively of lectures and newspaper articles, while an early comedy, *Racine* (1826), and the well-known *Histoire des marionnettes* (1854) were his only separate publications These men are almost unique specimens at this time of the pure literary critic, who neither meddles with politics on the one hand, nor as a rule essays original creative work on the other.

University leaders

Next we come to the famous University teachers, the "triumvirate of the Sorbonne" who turned their professorial chairs, as one of them says himself, into veritable tribunes Guizot, Cousin, and Villemain were young in years, yet had already suffered in the cause of freedom Driven from France by Napoleon, they had utilised their exile by studying foreign thought and philosophy. They came back still young, full of ardour and learning, with the name of martyrs, and a taking reputation for heresy. They supplanted Royer-Collard, Maine de Biran, and Degérando, as these had previously ousted the sensationalist thinkers of the moribund Eighteenth Century. Even under the new régime their work did not escape suspicion. Suspended more than once, they were finally reinstated in 1828, and the next three years saw them at the height of their influence. Electrifying their hearers, counting audiences by thousands, following up the attack in pamphlet and newspaper article, they swayed

both the rising and risen generation with the irresistible might of eloquence Each had his special work, and during the long contest which ended in 1828 each had done much to prepare the way for the success which rewarded them.

Villemain

Abel-François Villemain (1790-1870) was appointed at the age of twenty-six to the chair of Belles Lettres at the Sorbonne, and to other similar chairs elsewhere His facile rhetoric, wide reading, and sound critical taste attracted thousands of hearers, whose attention he directed to foreign and to early French literature In his great work, *Cours de littérature française*, reproducing his lectures of 1827-30, full prominence is given to these two elements Goethe and other contemporary critics spoke with warm praise of Villemain's critical lucubrations. To us, reading them, these volumes may seem scarcely to justify such encomiums They were written to be delivered, and have the faults as well as the merits of their origin But his width of view, historical faculty, and imaginative fervour, still command respect, and were expressed in form which retains much of Classic grace and precision. Made a deputy under Louis-Philippe, he became a Peer of France in 1831, and Minister of Public Instruction in 1834, his friend Guizot being then in power For many years Secretary to the French Academy, he served a second time as Minister under Guizot, and died just in time to escape that catastrophe of the German War, which would have filled him with acutest regrets and forebodings.

Even more illustrious, and by all accounts a still more perfervid orator, François - Pierre - Guillaume Guizot (1787-1874) lived to a yet greater age, and attained to yet higher honours

Guizot

Born at Nîmes, brought up mostly in Switzerland, Guizot was professor of modern history in Paris as early as 1812, threw in his lot with Louis XVIII, and in 1816 received a high appointment in the Civil Service Of this and other preferments he was deprived in 1821, and in 1825 was inhibited from lecturing. His period of silence produced two books of historical *Mémoires*, and was also signalised by the publication of the aforesaid version of Shakespeare, of which he was editor-in-chief. His lectures in 1828-30, after triumphant return to his chair (*Cours d'histoire moderne*), were immensely effective After 1830 he took service in politics, became Minister and Ambassador to England, and finally succeeded Thiers as Prime Minister in 1840. Driven once more to England in 1848, he devoted himself after 1851 entirely to his first love, Literature, to whom his allegiance had been unbroken even among the harassing duties of State Government. His best known works, besides translations and letters, are his Histories of the English Revolution (1850 *seq*) and of Mediæval France (31 vols), his studies of Corneille and Shakespeare, his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps* (1858) and *Meditations on Christianity* (1866), his *Mélanges* literary and political (1868 and 1869), and his *History of France recounted to my Children* (posthumous). As a statesman, he did

much for French education. As man of letters, his name stands second to none, even of the brilliant historical school that surrounded him Protestant, he lent weight to the reaction in favour of Christianity by precept and example. In his life and his works, the moralist stands revealed, teaching, correcting, not content with merely describing The taste of our day may scarcely tolerate this rigorous standpoint. But Guizot's strong and austere studies will outlive persiflage and cynicism, and assure him a place among those who have earned the world's thanks by their work.

Victor Cousin (1792-1867) completes this remarkable trio, and shared their opinions and fortunes His best work was done in philosophy Starting as assistant to Royer-Collard, he was at first an adherent of the "Scottish School" of thought, and afterwards widened his horizon by a visit to Germany in 1817 In spite of the well-known story of his asking Hegel for a short account of his philosophy in French, and receiving for answer, "My system cannot be described shortly, nor in French"—in spite of this rebuff, Cousin cultivated close relations with Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Jacobi, and others Silenced in 1821, and even arrested and kept prisoner at Berlin in 1825, he during 1827-30 lectured with no less éclat than the others. His system was eclectic. If Villemain wedded history with literature, and Guizot with philosophy, Cousin allied metaphysics to poetry, and united both to history. In 1832, like the others, he took office, but his political life only interests as revealing the nature of the man. Courteous and

Cousin

stately, he bore his honours gallantly, nor heeded too much his reverses It is as philosopher, or historian of philosophy, that his name will live, as the editor of Proclus (1820-27), Descartes (1826), Maine de Biran (1834-41), and Abelard (1849)—the translator of Plato (1825-40) and Tennemann's History of Philosophy (1829)—the author of many *Manuals* and *Introductions* to philosophy, as well as to *Scholastic Philosophy* (1840) and the *Philosophy of Kant* (1842) Lucid and graceful, his writings did what literary charm could to popularise the great German thinkers, and led his readers back to the best of Greek and mediæval philosophy But he erected no new landmarks, left no distinctive contribution of his own to metaphysics Like his colleagues, he was middle-man rather than originator, *vulgarisateur* as his countrymen phrase it The work of the triumvirate was less to create new ideas than to popularise the old, to familiarise France with the best work of other ages and countries. Well indeed they did this, and the enthusiasm of hearers and readers carried their teaching far and wide, helping powerfully in the reconstitution of French methods and beliefs and admirations

Disciples of Cousin.

Among followers of Cousin may be named Théodore-Simon Jouffroy (1796-1842), who became his assistant-lecturer, and carried on his exposition of the Scottish philosophers. Jouffroy's chief books were *Mélanges philosophiques* (1833 and 1842), *Cours de droit naturel* (1835-42) and *Cours d'esthétique* (1843). Sketches of him have been written by M. Taine and M. Tissot His pen was engaged by *Le*

Globe in the heroic prime of that paper, and among others whose contributions did good work about the same time may be mentioned Jean-Philibert Damiron (1794-1862), whose History of French Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century first came out in its columns (1828), followed by a *Cours de philosophie* (1831); and Charles-François-Marie, Comte de Rémusat (1797-1875), eminent later as historian and statesman, but then studying English and supporting Liberal principles as a professional journalist

History Michaud, Barante, Sismondi

In historical study the new influences were strongly at work Philosophic history, tracing events to causes, and considering motives and conditions almost more than action, may be said to have been created as regards France by Guizot, and owes its genesis to his study of German Side by side with this arose another school, who laid pre-eminent weight on vivid description, and sought less to philosophise than to make the Past live before us The patriarch of this school was J G Michaud (1767-1839), poet and historian, who after a voyage to the East produced his *Histoire des Croisades* in nine volumes (1838), besides a long series of sketches written in conjunction with his friend and fellow-traveller Poujoulat. With him compare the Baron de Barante (1782-1866), whose massive *Histoire des ducs de Bourgogne* (1824-28) unites the naïveté of a mediæval chronicle with more conscious art and practised pictorial skill. The more eminent historians, however, combined both methods. De

Sismondi (Jean-Charles-Léonard Simonde, 1773-1842), in whom met Italian ancestry, French parentage, and Swiss nativity (while his wife was English), appeared early in the field with his *Histoire des républiques italiennes du moyen-âge* (16 vols, 1809-18). Educated in Geneva, he was driven by political troubles to visit England and Italy, and in the latter wrote his *Littérature du midi* (4 vols, 1813, English translation by Thomas Roscoe, 1823). His next book, *Nouveaux principes d'économie politique* (2 vols, 1819, English translation, 1847), reveals the ferment of changing ideals and opinions. Yet his style was not affected by this. His habit of thought was cold, and his great *Histoire des Français* (31 vols, 1821-44) is able rather than interesting, immensely learned, but showing little charm of manner or sympathy with what he describes. (An English translation, begun 1849, stopped midway in the second volume.) For Lardner's Cyclopædia he wrote a one-volume summary of his *Italian Republics* (1832), and a sketch of the earlier Middle Ages (*Fall of the Roman Empire*, 2 vols, 1834). Most of his life was spent at Geneva, and though French was his native language, he seems scarcely French in genius or expression.

Thierry

Augustin Thierry (1795-1856) excelled where Sismondi failed. Chateaubriand and Scott had inspired him with passionate love of the Past. He tells us how he revelled in descriptions of the followers of Clovis, and went about murmuring to himself—

"Pharamond! Pharamond! nous avons combattu avec l'épée!"

and how *Quentin Durward* and *Ivanhoe* came to complete the impression. Writing first in journals, in the *Courier* and *Censeur européen*, he gradually amassed material for his great works, *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* (1825; revised edition, 1858), and *Lettres sur l'histoire de France* (1827), followed by the characteristic *Récits des temps mérovingiens* (1840) and other writings. A pupil of St Simon in early days, a friend of Comte in later, Thierry has strongly marked philosophical views, allied to vivid power of delineation His brother, Amedée Thierry (1797-1873), also a historian of note, avoided rivalry by confining his researches to ancient times, and his History of Gaul (1840-47) and the like have not the verve which distinguishes the style of the elder Thierry.

Even more remarkable, however, was the personality of Jules Michelet (1798-1874), a later and fierier follower on similar lines. Parisian born and bred, he was at the time we are treating merely a pamphleteer, writing historical *tableaux* (1825-26), a *Précis* of modern history (1827), a sketch of Vico's Principles of the philosophy of history (same date) The earlier volumes of his great History of France (1833-44) first revealed him to the world Poet as well as historian, he is not content even to make the Past live, he must reveal the springs of its life also. Geography, with him, becomes living and dramatic. The soil from which they spring is shown to have shaped human races. No reader can forget those marvellous pictures in which, with something of

Michelet

Carlyle's vividness, he calls up before us the colour, the appearance, the character of the French provinces. He conducts us through history like a guide, glowing with emotion as he describes, thrilling us because we feel he is thrilled himself Of his later work we may not speak His attack on the Jesuits (*Du prêtre, de la femme, de la famille*; 1845), his loss of place under Louis Napoleon, his more recent booklets of pure description, these belong to the volume after ours But his dawning genius was nurtured by the *Restauration*, and to the end he retained the glow of his springtide, the dew of his youth. His *Histoire* has been not unjustly styled "the lyrical epic of France" If Romantic History took its rise with Thierry, it reached its zenith with Michelet

Contemporary with him was a more famous man, but lesser writer, Louis Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877).

Thiers

Child of the South of France, his life and writings had the impulsiveness and easy largeness we associate with that type, His history is the work of a politician rather than a student. His *Histoire de la révolution française* (1823-27) cannot be trusted as a record of facts, his later *History of the Consulate and the Empire* is an ambitious but scarcely a successful work. His political life does not concern us, though by it he will most be remembered. But his articles in the *Constitutional*, and later in the *National*, made him a force as well as a figure in the Paris of the Bourbons

Another great moving power, apart from either

philosophy or history proper, was that which created the word *Socialism* Claude Henri, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825), was now infirm and old, thanks to hardship and distress more than years, but from 1817 to 1825 he poured forth a stream of tracts on industrial questions, while his chief work, *Le nouveau christianisme*, appeared in the year of his death. His mantle fell on François Marie Charles Fourier (1772-1837), proposer of the famous *phalange*, whose chief works came out between 1820 and 1830 Literary historians may ignore these writers (the former is of course to be distinguished from his ancestor of the great *Mémoires*[1]), but their teaching contributed powerfully to the general upheaval Both were men of pure aim, ready to go any length in destroying a social order which caused, they thought, evils without number In striking opposition to de Maistre and de Bonald, they regarded civilisation as devilish rather than divine Pushing Rousseau's doctrine to the full, and systematising what with him was vague declamation, they were ready with matured schemes for transforming all existing institutions. Fourier worked long in solitude, but Saint-Simon had enthusiastic disciples, and left behind him a journal, *Le producteur* (1825-26), which was carried on for some short time by these Among the most ardent of them was Barthélemy-Prospere Enfantin (1796-1864), who was principally responsible for *Doctrine de Saint-Simon* (1830) and kindred works,

Socialistic school

[1] Which themselves, it may be noticed, were printed for the first time in the year 1824

and who himself suffered prosecution on account of his articles Perhaps, however, the most important result of these men's teaching — characteristic and influential as it was in itself, and permanent in its impress on all social theories—was that it paved the way, as we shall see later, for the philosophical system of Comte

Natural science

French genius for scientific research, and brilliance of exposition, were well represented during the Restoration era Lamarck (1744-1829) was still publishing his *Histoire des animaux sans vertèbres* (1815-22). Cuvier (1769-1832) was Chancellor of the University of Paris, and issuing *Le regne animal* (1817) and other famous books Arago (1786-1853) is a prominent figure throughout our period, both as astronomer, and after 1830 as politician Jean-François Champollion (1791-1832) in his too short life created the science of Egyptology. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1772-1844) was great as a naturalist, and two others of the name as botanists. The list might be extended without trouble. If we do not dwell on the writings of these and other notable workers, it is because they only indirectly reflected themselves in contemporary literature, though doubtless playing an appreciable part in creating the general tone and atmosphere of the time.

Such in outline was the intellectual France of those days Full of ferment, of seeking, of reaction, loving

what was old, yet ready to make a clean sweep of the most venerable idols, receptive to a degree, child-like in its faith and its fickleness, an age of dreams and research and bold experiment. Into this *milieu* was born the greatest poet of his Century, in France at least, some would say in Europe. Victor-Marie Hugo (1802-85) mirrored and summed up his time. Parisian born and bred, son of one of Napoleon's generals, his precocious genius brought him very early into print, and 1822 saw his first important work, the earlier *Odes*. *Han d'Islande* followed in 1823, *Bug-Jargal* in 1824, claiming prose fiction too for his province, but the later *Odes et ballades* (1826), *Cromwell* (1827), and *Les Orientales* (1828) are more interesting to us. In the prefaces to these he formulates his poetical creed. That to *Cromwell*, in particular, is a long and laboured study, in which he distinguishes three stages, alike in the world's history and in that of a nation, to which correspond three classes of poetry — lyric, epic, dramatic. Drama is the latest and most comprehensive, and deals largely in the grotesque as a subject of art. Molière is the chief poet of France, Shakespeare, combining in himself the genius of Corneille, Molière, and Beaumarchais, is the "god" of modern poetry. To make facts square with this theory, he explains that Greek tragedy is essentially epic, and so is Pindar. All belonging to the ancient world he calls *classic*, to the modern *romantic*. Thus defined, it is easy to contend that classic rules are out of place now, and in particular that the "three

Victor Hugo

unities" must give place to one unity, that of action. He would fain indeed knock all theories on the head, and substitute simply Nature, freedom, and truth No subject is bad in itself, "there are neither good nor bad subjects, only good and bad poets" Everything is material for art, nothing can be accounted alien to poetry.

We catch a hint of Wordsworth in these views, where truth characteristically mingles with invention

Hernani. Hugo professes to have studied English writers He has consulted scores of such while writing *Cromwell*, he makes no secret of his preference for foreign ideals "Les autres peuples disent: Homère, Dante, Shakespeare Nous disons Boileau" Little wonder that his doctrines were scouted by French critics of the old school. A veritable storm raged round his head. This battle royal of the styles culminated at the first performance of *Hernani* (1830) *Cromwell* was not intended for the stage, being on too large a scale. Its five acts comprise seventy-five scenes, the second alone having twenty-four *Hernani* was written to act, though a critic like Hugo might fairly call it a lyric in five acts. Its production by the Théâtre-Français was a gage of battle thrown down The critics mustered in force to damn it But on the other side came the young poets who by this time had rallied round Hugo's banner A motley regiment, with long hair and outlandish raiment, Gautier's red waistcoat conspicuous as an oriflamme, they yelled, and cheered, and gesticulated. Youth carried the day,

with Freedom and Romance as its watchwords, *Hernani* was the symbol of a cause, and as such it was acclaimed, quite apart from its merits.

English actors in Paris

It is worth recalling that during the winter of 1827-28—the winter in which *Cromwell* was written—an English company, of which Charles Kemble, Macready, and Miss Henrietta Smithson were the chief stars, performed Shakespeare in Paris amid great enthusiasm. This was at once cause and sign of change Shakespeare-olatry became the fashion, though we shall see cause later to doubt whether the craze ever took firm hold on the public. On Hugo, however, as afterwards on his disciple Musset, the effect produced was enduring, and largely influenced him in making the strong stand he did for Romantic as opposed to Classical drama The English actors' visit only deepened an impression already made, but it partly explains the advance from *Cromwell* to *Hernani*.

Revolution in terms

The dispute between *classical* and *romantic* was largely a matter of terms Goethe defined "classical" as equivalent to healthy, strong, joyous, "romantic" as equivalent to sickly, weak, morbid To Hugo, on the contrary, "romantic" meant whatever was modern Disputes based on such loose phrasing can help us little. Hugo's polemics are of small value now, what is really important is the part he played in renovating French verse. And this can scarcely be exaggerated. He found a limited vocabulary, and a highly artificial form of metre The French "alexandrine," never a very ductile verse, had been

hardened by generations of pedants into cast-iron stiffness. More even than our heroic couplet, it was fettered by rule and precedent Hugo broke through these. His trick of *enjambement*, that is, letting one line run on into another in sense, was probably learned from English models. But he also substituted variety of cadence within the line itself for the monotonous regularity so dear to the Classicists The line became musical, it sang instead of speaking Moreover, he widened the bounds of poetic diction, and valued words for themselves A word may be a duke, he said, or a clown (*grimaud*), in either case I want it We can clearly trace Wordsworth's influence in this utterance, and, like Wordsworth, the French insurrectionists often went too far They used phrases meant to startle, words whose only merit was their novelty These were extravagances incidental to a revolutionary outbreak. As with Wordsworth's

> "Tub like those
> Which women use to wash their clothes,"

maturer taste would condemn mere pettiness But revolutions are not made with rose-water. And this was nothing short of a Revolution, as thorough-going in its way as the political one which preceded it

Victor Hugo was its leader. Not that he was first to begin. But his power soon placed him at its head, and we may as well consider it in and through him. It is the earlier Hugo we deal with here. In later life his extravagance kept pace with his power No experiment was too daring,

Freedom and sonority

in subject or in style. But up to 1850 Hugo, though a rebel, was never an anarchist Even his metrical experiments were cautiously made The alexandrine remained his chief measure, often grouped into stanzas, octosyllabic verse (after Scott and Byron) was the principal variant His variety of rhythm was attained by simple means, and only developed hints found in the Classical masters themselves Syntax was respected as yet, at a later date, like Browning, he "loved to dock the minor parts of speech" Rhyme was emphasised, but not made grotesque. It is only in his plays that Hugo's earlier verse is appreciably lax; in his lyrics, the structure is still precise, though the cadence is altered The revelation throughout Hugo's verse was the tone, the singing quality, as above said Here was something that had not been heard in France, one might say, since Ronsard. Sensuous delight in sound came in with the Romantics. The sonority of Hugo's verse, his bold figures, his use of abstractions and lofty metaphors, all had something intoxicating for his contemporaries. Even a lesser poet could have carried people off their feet with these

Hugo's earlier verse is mainly lyric Indeed, it is lyrical in substance, even when not in form. Above all else, he is singer. After the poems above mentioned came *Feuilles d'automne* (1831), *Chants du crépuscule* (1835), *Voix intérieures* (1837), and *Les rayons et les ombres* (1840). And then followed a pause, so that *Les châtiments* (1852) and the

Chief early writings

first part of *La légende des siècles* (1859) belong to a later Hugo. He was not idle, however. In drama, *Marion Delorme* (1830) and *Le roi s'amuse* (1832) inaugurated a succession of plays, leading up to the misfortune of *Les Burgraves* (1843), a failure which turned him from writing for the stage. In prose romance, *Notre-Dame de Paris* (1831) was the greatest of a series, equalled only when long after he produced *Les misérables* (1862). Meantime, he had turned to politics, and become a member of the Academy. From 1830 to 1848 he sat as member of Assembly, and the success of Louis-Philippe, says one critic, consoled him for the defeat of *Les Burgraves*. In 1845 he was made a Peer of France, and at the close of our period was at the height of his popularity.

Character of his work

Even if Hugo had died in 1850, he would still have been a great poet. Perhaps his lyrical style culminated in the above-mentioned poems of 1852 and 1859. But the poems published during the Thirties would have made a reputation. Apart from style, they impress as do none of his contemporaries. The "lyrical cry," the egoism of the new school, find splendid utterance. For Romanticism exalted above all else the individual view. Every man was a Byron, seeking to utter the voice of his own heart, for good or evil. That Byron's actual influence was strong, goes without saying. He personified the self-sufficiency, the daring, the mystery and gloom, the Nature-worship, the love of liberty and hatred of formulas, which every Romantic cherished as his ideal. Hugo, too, drank

at this fount The influence of Byron was strong on him in lyric poetry, as that of Shakespeare in drama, and that of Scott in romance. But he was very far from a copyist. All that went into his mind came forth transformed, made his own by the right of genius. France needed a new poet, and found him in Victor Hugo Had he died at the age of Byron, he would still have been the great Romantic poet. The magnificent achievements of his later life, the triumphs both in prose and verse which followed 1850, in particular the epic largeness of the great works which his old age poured forth up to his death in unabated volume, may tempt us to regard the period before 1850 as but a promise of what was to come. But in and by itself, even had nothing more followed, the work of that period places him in the first rank.

Other Romantics

Hugo was not the earliest Romantic He even held back a little at first, though he finally accepted leadership The real originators were a group of writers who, about 1823, met in frequent conclave, and started in that year a short-lived paper called *La Muse française* Of these the best-known were Charles Nodier (1783-1844), Émile Deschamps (1791-1871), Antony Deschamps (1800-69), Jules Lefèvre (1797-1857), and Alfred de Vigny (1797-1863). Nodier was author of many imaginative books, including one then lately published called *Trilby* The brothers Deschamps were fellow-students with him of foreign literature, while Lefèvre aspired to

write original poetry Vigny alone requires detailed mention. These and others, including some ladies, were contributors to the paper. They professed indeed to repudiate the name *Romantic*, introduced into France by Madame de Staël, but they preached the doctrines we know by that name, attacking all poetry which was merely imitative, and claiming for the poet the right to see with his own eyes, and speak with his own tongue. Victor Hugo had close relations with them, and wrote in their journal. His prefaces, indeed, contain nothing that had not been put forward by these writers But it was not till 1827, till the preface to *Cromwell*, that he placed himself at their head By this time the original journal was defunct, and its place taken by *Le Globe*, which ran its course from 1824 to 1830 A new *Cénacle*, founded in 1829, included, with Nodier and Vigny, Hugo himself, Dumas, Sainte-Beuve, and later on Musset These are the names that we associate with Hugo as Romantic leaders, and they must be considered separately.

Alfred-Victor, Comte de Vigny (1797-1863), began with an anonymous volume of verse (1822), followed by *Eloa* (1824) and *Poèmes* (1826) The same year as the last saw his historical novel *Cinq Mars*, after which he published only a few additions to the *Poèmes*, one or two prose works, a translation of *Othello*, and two dramas, *La maréchale d'Ancre* (1830) and *Chatterton* (1835) He left at his death a new volume of verse called *Destinées*, and his *Journal d'un poète*. He married an English wife, and was elected to the Academy the year after Hugo.

Vigny

Vigny's output is thus comparatively small, but it is stamped with his individuality He was a purer artist than Hugo, in the sense that he was artist and little beside. His polished elegance sat oddly on his youthful radicalism. The latter was soon dropped indeed, with him it had been little more than a cloak for disgust at the present. Nodier was a strong Royalist, his younger friends, born under the Empire, and remembering its glory while never having felt its pain, inclined to favour the "Napoleonic idea" But politics soon lost their charm for Vigny He withdrew into himself, sat in his "tower of ivory," and chiselled his verses assiduously Pessimism grew on him with age. Nature and liberty ceased to seem venerable, while the egotism and riotous personalities of his friends repelled his austerer taste De Vigny was thus never a leader, and latterly not even a follower, of the Romantic School. But in early days his calm elegance, his stateliness and sweetness of music, were elements whose influence it were ungrateful to deny. And his haughty coldness, his proclamation of the inherent misery of man and futility of looking for aid from above, his stoicism and his pessimism, could scarcely fail to impress when reiterated by so powerful and original a singer.

Poet and novelist

Nor must we forget his prose work In 1826, before Hugo had done more than try his 'prentice hand on fiction, de Vigny published *Cinq Mars*, an historical novel of great power, spoiled by faulty method Confounding the provinces of

history and fiction, the student of Richelieu tried to combine both in one chef-d'œuvre, and ended by achieving neither But his failure is finer than many men's success. Of his dramas, again, *Chatterton* is certainly a work of genius. something more than patriotic sympathy, assuredly, makes us hail this a masterpiece But he lives above all as lyrist, as the chanter of high and solemn, though painful, themes, and his Biblical poems particularly, from the early "Moses" to the terrible "Christ on the Mount of Olives," are piercing in their thought as they are masterly in their music

Omitting Dumas for the present, the next oldest of this band of friends was Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve (1804-69) And Sainte-Beuve was an important member of the group. Critic from the first, he taught them to look to the Sixteenth Century for the inspiration they found wanting in the Eighteenth His earliest publication (1828) embraced a *Tableau* of French poetry, coupled with an edition of Ronsard, and both volumes were widely read The *Premiers lundis* also belong to this time, having been written for *Le Globe*, to which he contributed from the beginning But he also wrote poems. These were collected in the anonymous *Vie et poésies de Joseph Delorme* (1829) and *Consolations* (1830), after which he published no more verse except *Pensées d'août* (1837), a volume of little moment. He also published one novel, *Volupté* (1834). For the rest, he became the most famous critic, not in France only, but in Europe. His career reminds one of Matthew Arnold, whose admira-

Sainte-Beuve

tion of him was so great Both began with poetry, Arnold the more accomplished craftsman, though hardly always a spontaneous singer But while Arnold had to drudge at school-inspection for bread, Sainte-Beuve supported himself entirely by writing. His unequalled series of *causeries*, from the *Portraits littéraires* of 1829 to the *Nouveaux lundis* of 1863, brought modest fortune as well as fame These, with the special volumes on *Port-Royal* (1837) and *Chateaubriand* (1849), constitute his real record. The supreme critic needs no word of homage But let his early efforts in verse have their meed too They did much, like his criticisms, to enforce on the Romantics the necessity and beauty of form Checking the natural tendency to lawlessness, they taught young poets to be a law to themselves. Otherwise, they are little memorable The morbid strain, later so conspicuous in Baudelaire, is sufficiently apparent in Sainte-Beuve. But he did much for the Romantic Movement, and to his early friendship and encouragement Hugo himself owed a debt which he was not slow to acknowledge It may not be superfluous to note that Sainte-Beuve, through his mother's mother, had English blood in him.

Alfred de Musset (1810-57) was a later addition to the coterie, and in many ways its *enfant terrible*

Musset

"Spoiled child of a world which he spoiled," no pranks were too freakish for him, in life or in poetry. His was the famous comparison of the moon above a church-spire to the letter *i* with its dot, which proved too much for many hesitating adherents.

He tried wildest experiments with metre as with sense, and delighted in nothing but what was strange and bizarre. His mocking spirit soon drove him from the Romantics into independence, and he boasted that, "though his glass might be little, yet he drank from his own glass." And they were well quit of him. What he had common with them was mainly his tireless egotism, the acuteness and vibrance of his "lyrical cry." His art was carelessness itself; he made a virtue of negligence, and laughed at canons of style In thought, he did not share their hope, their trust in the future. Hugo never lacked faith. Life to him was serious, and confidence natural.

"Ce siècle est grand et fort
. . . De meilleurs jours sont prêts"
"Homme, ne crains rien! la nature
Sait le grand secret, et sourit"

But Musset, Voltairean and dandy, had neither hope nor belief.

"En vérité, ce siècle est un mauvais moment"
"Je suis venu trop tard dans un monde trop vieux"

In Byronic mood, he could but vow himself unsufferably bored, and invite the world to view his boredom Like Byron, he turned melancholy into a jest, and despair into a semblance of philosophy; and the world, content to take him at his own valuation, smiled or sorrowed with him as he chose to bid, and danced obediently to his piping.

The events of Musset's life scarcely need recounting.

As a writer he was precocious, *Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie* (1830) being the work of his 'teens. His most brilliant time was from 1833 to 1837. The record of those years includes in serious poetry *Rolla* and the *Nuits* (especially those of May and October), with the curiously effusive *Letter to Lamartine*, in comedy, *On ne badine pas avec l'amour*, perhaps the happiest of his sparkling *Comédies et proverbes*, and the prose *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*. This last was written after his too notorious visit to Italy, usually supposed to form a crisis in his life. But it is difficult to see that it left any trace on his poetry, which to the last retains the careless, self-centred, irresponsible heedlessness of boyhood. Pre-eminently the poet of youthful passion, he tuned this one string of his lyre to perfection. When he strikes it he is always successful, and his indolent grace more pleasing than the labour of stronger bards. Unhappily, even this theme palls with repetition, and de Musset had no other to offer in its place. He outlived his impulse, and dragged wearily through later life, a youth who did not know how to grow old. But the freshness of his younger poems, the resonance with which they struck the chord of passion, survives even the satiety of readers, and their just disappointment at his indifference to art. Even an age that sneered at Byron found something to admire in Musset, and there is little doubt that his place is secure among the lyrists of his day, while his graceful comedy will always constitute another claim to remembrance.

Work and limitations

Leaving now the *Cénacle*, we trace the further de-

velopment of the school One year younger than Musset, Pierre-Jules-Théophile Gautier (1811-72) was a stronger and more serious artist Erratic and unconventional in habits, apparently heedless and even slipshod in art, Gautier was long deemed the "wild man" of the Movement, defiant and hare-brained He was really a conscientious and indefatigable worker, and his famous motto, "Art for its own sake" (*l'art pour l'art*), whatever its limitations, is a philosophy in itself. His poetry goes into small bulk, and divides naturally into two classes There are the early *Poésies* (1830), *Albertus* (1833), and *Comédie de la mort* (1838), republished in 1845 with additions under the title of *Poésies complètes;* and there is *Émaux et camées* (1852) This latter contains Gautier's best verse, in his most perfect style The former are sometimes crude. *Albertus* was "wild" enough—a young writer's leap into the sea of poetry, as Keats phrased it, *Death's Comedy* was a remarkable production for any writer. *España*, one of the poems added in 1845, is a masterpiece of description. In all these earlier poems we see the travailing artist. Next to Hugo, Gautier is the ablest craftsman, the hardest worker, of the school. He tries experiments, not freakishly like Musset, but gravely and purposefully. He shares Hugo's delight in sound, his love of words for themselves. He ransacks the dictionary for striking expressions, and revels in reviving obsolete phrases. He carries pictorial description to its height, and his pages literally glow with colour. Like Hugo, too, he sometimes

Gautier

cares more for the music of a line than for its sense: take care of the words, and the meaning will take care of itself In all this, he was Hugo's right-hand man, his ablest lieutenant, striving and fighting, and ready to accept any task. But in *Émaux et camées* he is the perfect artist come to his own, expressing his idea with the apparent ease of victory

Strength of his work

Gautier was not only a poet Poetry, he says himself, is not an abiding state of mind So early as 1835 appeared his novel *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, with its amusing preface In this book we see Romanticism passing into "Naturalism" With Prosper Mérimée, he discovered the short story, as we know it to-day. From *Fortunio* (1838) onward to *Spirite* (1866), these are always masterly He was besides a diligent dramatic critic, and an interesting writer of travel-books. Of the latter, *Caprices et zigzags* was the forerunner, while his stage criticisms were published in book-form under the somewhat pretentious title *L'Histoire de l'art dramatique en France* Among many other works, his posthumous *Histoire du romantisme* and *Contemporary Portraits* deserve especial notice here. But enough has been said to show Gautier as the conscientious, painstaking artist and industrious littérateur, not the volatile, reckless innovator he is sometimes depicted He and Hugo did not contend for the mere liberty of art, to quote the latter's distinction, but for liberty *in* art Gautier never forgot that art was his medium His notions of what is suitable for art may sometimes conflict with ours; but, given his notions, he is always true to art.

He does not gloat upon vice for its own sake, though he introduces it freely when he thinks art requires it As poet, he is less pure lyrist than the others; less inspiration, more artificiality His metrical faculty is limited; latterly he seldom goes beyond a simple octosyllabic quatrain. He is no thinker, in the broad sense; painting, not thinking, was his idea of art. He gives what he sees, does not try to press further But, with all limitations, Gautier is the ablest and strongest of those who rallied round Hugo's banner in the great fight with Convention, he alone developed the Romantic teaching along independent and forceful lines of his own

Beginnings of change

Here a halt must be called. Already during Gautier's lifetime, new developments appear. The Romantic Triumph in poetry was over Its leaders were scattered, or silent for the time Lamartine and Hugo plunged into politics Vigny would not, and Musset could not, wave higher the deserted standard, Gautier preferred less arduous work in prose. The throng of fight surged elsewhere Other men, other ideas, other methods, came in place of those just sketched Romantic egoism had gone too far. Men began to feel that they were, after all, not isolated units, each confronting the infinite on its own account, but members of a corporate body. Byronism went finally out of fashion A later mode succeeded, and took the fickle fancy of the many It is time to retrace our steps, to consider how far prose-writing, imaginative or didactic, shared

the fortunes of poetry. Yet before leaving the Romantic poets, let us remember that Hugo, the greatest of them all, was also the only one who survived the wreck and dissolution of his school He alone had originality and vigour enough to secure poetic triumphs in wider fields, when the limits set by the Romantic ideal were found too narrow for the desires of a new generation. And let us recur for a moment to the genius of that writer who gave the first signal for the Romantic assault, but whom we have hitherto left aside in dealing with his eager and often undisciplined followers.

The mention of Lamartine in last paragraph reminds us that as yet we have noticed only his first *Méditations* (1820) These were followed by the *New Meditations* and *Death of Socrates* (1823), *Dernier chant du Childe-Harold* (1825), and *Harmonies* (1830) Through this important decade, and later, Lamartine retained his poetical pre-eminence. The last-named volume secured his admission to the Academy Noble by family, and rich by marriage, Lamartine seemed to unite the favours of genius and fortune Secretary of legation at Florence, or residing in a "villa magnifique" near Leghorn, he was grand seigneur and great poet at once, a later and less disreputable Lord Byron. After the revolution of 1830, he resigned his diplomatic office, and set forth on a tour to the East, carried through in princely style. The death of a young daughter during this tour saddened and sombred his thought, and after returning he

Lamartine

published *Jocelyn* (1836) and *The Angel's Fall* (1838), the latter especially full of deep and strange fancies *Recueillements poétiques* (1839) completed his poetical work For after this he turned earnestly to politics The poetical dreamer was found an active worker and an impassioned orator. His *History of the Girondins* (1847) was a political manifesto, full of poetic fire, if not of impeccable accuracy. And finally, in 1848, the astonishing spectacle was shown of a poet wielding supreme power, and dominating a people by sheer eloquence and enthusiasm. For a brief interval Lamartine was Dictator of France. Then the plot thickened, and in 1851 the coup d'état of Louis-Napoleon drove him from public life Bankrupt in fortune, and to some extent in reputation, he lived through the Second Empire the life of a hard-working littérateur, and passed away at last, happy in an opportune death, not long before that Second Empire crashed to its fall

With this latest Lamartine we have not to do. His autobiographical memoirs and correspondence, from *Confidences* (1849) onward, are charmingly written, and form a treasure-house of information. His *Voyage en Orient* (1833), historical works, and romances (of which the first was *Raphael*, 1849) have merit, though not of the highest class. But it is as poet and statesman that he will live, and it is as poet we consider him here. And as poet he cannot be lightly esteemed. Gautier, no biassed critic, says he was not so much a poet as poetry itself This is still the impression his verse

His real importance

makes We forget to think of art, forget to scrutinise the form of utterance. Art Lamartine studied little. He is the last great improvisatore, pouring forth music and passion in what seem "profuse strains of unpremeditated" song. His method is that of Scott and Byron Then his thought is spiritual and earnest Unlike the decadent Romantics, he takes the soul for his province It does Gautier the more honour that he felt the poetical quality of verse so far removed in motive from his own. Sainte-Beuve might sneer at the "poetry of a country clergyman," but this is to let judgment be warped by party prejudice. Not that Lamartine is to be ranked with the greatest poets. He is too shadowy, too subjective, too averse to the labour of architectonic imagination. Content to dream, to ponder, to chronicle impressions and moods and feelings, he is more a singer than a maker. His poems lack substance They are reveries or invocations, and scarcely ever tell a distinct story. This applies especially to his early pieces, of which *Harmonies* may be taken as the perfected specimen In the later *Jocelyn* he does try to get away from himself, to tell a story, in *La chute d'un ange* he emulates Byron's ambitious "Heaven and earth" with little better success But it is by his earlier nature-poems that his admirers would wish to judge him. In these, the influence of Wordsworth is as perceptible as that of Byron His countrymen pronounce him a "Lakist" But to us the differences are greater than the resemblances. Coleridge's *Hymn in the Valley of Chamouni* may well

have inspired Lamartine But on the whole he is mainly himself, lordly and careless and prodigal, dealing with poetry *en grand prince*, with the weakness as well as the spontaneity of a gifted amateur Historically, even were his merit less, Lamartine's name must live. For he was a veritable revelation to his age, and preceded even Hugo as a contemner of moth-eaten trappings. His poetical vein, incomparably less rich than Hugo's, was probably worn thin before he left verse for politics, and is marked by the somewhat shallow optimism of one to whom evil had little reality. But so far as it goes, it is pure poetic gold; Lamartine deserves his high place among the earliest renovators of French song, and his reputation as one of the few philosophic poets with which the France of our Century has been gifted.

Some minor poets may be disposed of in a sentence apiece Gerard de Nerval (1808-55), whose real name was Labrunie, friend and collaborator of Gautier's, wrote many volumes of tales, travels, criticisms, and poems, in which a wistful grace, born of melancholy touched with humour, anticipates to some extent the mystico-romantic tone of later days Melchior-Frédéric Soulié (1800-47) deserves notice merely as an extravagant follower up and reducer to the ridiculous of Romantic methods, whether in tale, play, or poem. Henry Murger (1822-61), poet and novelist of "Bohemia," stands apart as mainly a student in the school of Béranger; Pierre Dupont (1821-70) as a natural lyrist who voiced the life of Southern France Theodore de Banville and

Minor verse

Leconte de Lisle belong distinctly to the next generation, and it does not seem necessary to characterise in detail the verse of such writers as Barbier, Barthélemy, Brizeux, Houssaye, Laprade, Moreau, or Pommier. For this is not a literary catalogue, and we are seeking to concentrate attention on the factors in a great movement, not to count curiously names of estimable but less important contemporaries.

A writer to be named in a class by himself is Marie-Henri Beyle (1783-1842), who wrote under the *nom de plume* of "Stendhal." Older than the Romantic poets, he has the merit of having given earliest utterance to their creed. In 1822, that important year for French poetry, appeared his *Racine et Shakspeare*, which may be called the first pronunciamento of truths eagerly urged by them. Beyle had had a remarkable life. A soldier under Napoleon, he had fought in Italy, and lived through the disastrous Russian campaign. He had been painter, merchant, and Government clerk, had lived in Italy from 1814 to 1821, and returned there as consul from 1830 to 1840. He had written descriptive books, and a *History of Italian painting* (1817), and was to be known later as a writer of ironical, paradoxical, mystifying essays, and tales, and romances. "I shall be understood about 1880," he said of himself. It does not appear that he had any acquaintance with the young Romancists. His own tastes were semi-Classical, semi-Voltairean, Buonapartist, and reactionary. But in the 1822 brochure he protested vigorously against merely imitative poetry, and so at least gave a

Stendhal

lead to the revolutionary impulse. He was a keen observer, and analyser, on the side of feeling, his main passion was love of Italy and Italian art. In literature he professed to think little of form; the use of literature is to examine ideas. His recently published *Journal* and *Souvenirs d'égotisme* throw additional light on his character, while Sainte-Beuve, Taine, and M. Zola have published studies of his work. His chief books, besides those named, are *Le rouge et le noir* (1831), *La chartreux de Parme* (1839), and his various *Œuvres de critique* his *Life of Napoleon* was published only in 1876. Beyle wrote no verse himself, and with him we appropriately quit the study of poetry for some consideration of the important works of fiction which came out simultaneously with the poetry of Lamartine, Hugo, and their followers

Fiction—Balzac

Prose fiction, next to poetry itself, takes most easily the stamp of imagination And it is no surprise to find that, side by side with the Romantic poets, there existed also a succession of eminent novelists The oldest of these was Honoré de Balzac (1799-1850) He may seem at first sight less easy to class according to our formulas. For shall we call Romantic the sordid verisimilitude of that astonishing series of novels which were meant to sum up *La comédie humaine?* Yes, and no. Compared with his great coevals, Dumas and George Sand, Balzac is certainly not Romantic. In the larger sense, the sense of Hugo, the sense in which the word denotes all that is human and Shakespearean and universal, as

opposed to pedantry and imitativeness and limitation, he is Romanticist indeed. To reflect French life in its fulness—nothing less would content Balzac. His shortcomings belong to himself, not to any restrictions of false theory. In him, as in Gautier, we see the Romantic impulse pass into Naturalism. But this is not a chronological development Balzac slightly precedes the Romantic novelists, both in date of birth and in order of first publication To regard him as the sequel to them is to misread fact For all we can see, his gigantic scheme may have been before him from the first. It had taken at least partial shape before Dumas or George Sand published their first stories. And all through the heyday of the Romantic novel he was clinging to his purpose amid difficulty and discouragement, labouring like a wolf, toiling day and night, his eyes always fixed on his own goal

Of humble origin, Balzac came early to Paris, and lived his life mainly there He was Parisian to the core. He knew Paris through and through, and the contrast between Parisian and provincial—to which we have fortunately no parallel in England—dominates all his conception. One word almost sums up his life—*writing* In poverty, in celibacy, solitary and far from his best friends, he toiled gigantically at his gigantic task. There were episodes, of course. Two duchesses befriended him, with one, Madame de Castries, we hear of him at Aix, given the offer of a run into Italy. He had a sister to correspond with; he dreamed like other men of marriage and domestic happiness But always, with brief

His life

exception, our view of him is of one toiling in a garret, overwhelmed with debt, full of enormous schemes and labours and promises to pay Toward the end the clouds lift. Free to love Madame Hanska,[1] he goes as her suitor to Poland (being at length obliged to rest), proposes, and is accepted. Financial affairs improve He gets ready a house in Paris, fills it with costly furniture, gorgeous as in one of his own novels And then the end comes After three months of marriage, he dies at the age of fifty-one, having barely set foot on the threshold of ease and love and happiness.

Balzac the man only interests as throwing light on Balzac the writer His passion for truth, his minuteness, his industry, his vanity, his *borné* nature, his true French love of system and generalisation, all come out in his *Correspondance* just as in his books. To enumerate the latter would be profitless. His first success was made with *La peau de chagrin* (1830) What went before was 'prentice-work. The next ten years are full of masterpieces. *Eugénie Grandet*, *Le père Goriot*, *La recherche de l'absolu*, and others belong to this period, as well as the Rabelaisian *Contes drolatiques* (1833), which stand apart from his other work In 1842 appeared his famous General Preface, explaining the scope and design of his whole work Subsequent novels fit in more precisely to their place in this structure; but all, later or earlier, may be regarded as sections of the whole. We have scenes from the *Vie privée*, *Vie*

His work

[1] For whom see *Lettres à l'étrangère*, vol i (Paris, 1899)

politique, Vie militaire, Vie de campagne, Vie de province, Vie parisienne. To this period belong *Les parents pauvres, La femme de trente ans, Les illusions perdues, Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes,* &c., &c., &c *Études philosophiques* and *Études analytiques* complete the projected scheme. The novels and short tales arranged under these heads fill the familiar edition "fifty volumes long" Add the *Contes drolatiques,* five or six comedies, miscellaneous writings whose bulk is not yet exactly ascertained, and the *Correspondance* (published 1876, English translation 1879), and we have some idea of the enormous quantity of work he produced Some remarks on the general scheme and purpose of Balzac's gigantic labours will exhaust the space that can be given to him here

Balzac was the author of the modern idea of the novel as a "human document" His aim was to photograph with absolute fidelity the entire facts of French life. That he failed in his attempt, even a foreigner may safely pronounce. To put it broadly, he left the spiritual out of his picture Men and women as animals—not using the word in any invidious sense—as busy with the concerns of daily life, eating and drinking, scheming and striving, bargaining and pushing and being pushed—these seem to live on his pages with absolute truth It may be objected that this is all he tried to do. But the terms of his Preface include much more. It would be as reasonable for a misogynist to omit all referring to love and marriage in a man's life, and then claim to have given a full account of that life And Balzac

Their subject

does not profess to exclude religion The Catholic Church figures constantly in his pages. He is Tory and *Restaurationist*, loyal to Church and State according to his lights. Only it is a Church without faith, and a kingship not supported by sentiment. Neither his prelates and priests on the one hand, nor his lay members on the other, have even a rudimentary sense of devotion That this is a gross libel on the French people, what was passing around him clearly shows. Devotion to an ideal was rife in a hundred forms It was staring him in the face, had he had eyes to see it. To ignore all this — to paint men and women as if selfishness and money-grubbing and social advancement and getting the better of one's friends or opponents were the chief and indeed sole object in life— surely implies considerable infidelity to facts, caused or conditioned probably by the observer's own limitations, not by any wilful blindness.

This deduction fairly made, we are free to enjoy. In all that regards the lower life Balzac is a competent critic. His novels are a sound protest against Romantic egoism, against the individual daring to regard himself as a self-poised, self-centred unity Behind and conditioning the individual Balzac sees the whole immensely complex system of modern society, without which the individual could not be what he is, could indeed hardly exist. He therefore aims, not so much at depicting the individual, as at depicting the whole of which he forms part Incidentally, his portraits of individuals are masterly and photographic (within his limits), for

His method

it is only by presenting units that you can represent a whole. But the whole is always present to his mind, it is it he is trying to bring before us. Laws and commerce and politics and art, private life and public, business and pleasure; all that makes up the diversified and complicated fabric of modern civilisation, this to Balzac is not merely the background against which the individual stands out, but itself part of his personality, the sum of which he constitutes a fraction. Man exists only as social unit To many this excessive generalisation will be distasteful, they prefer to ignore it, and base their admiration of Balzac merely on his observation of details. But Balzac himself would have scorned such praise, just as he disliked being called the "author of Eugénie Grandet." He aspired to paint the *Comédie humaine*, not merely the particles which compose it. For this he could scorn delights, and live laborious days (or rather nights) Encyclopædic knowledge, encyclopædic breadth of intellect, were required. Balzac had no doubt about possessing the latter, and little modesty about claiming the former, while losing no opportunity of enlarging and expanding it

Balzac's personality was strong and masterful. He had an iron constitution, none else could have stood the trials he gave it. Every now and then he came forth from his den, and was the delight of his friends and admirers Temperate even to monasticism in ordinary, he could crack a good bottle on occasion; but, like many of his exact time, detested smoking Poet he was not, and for verse

Aims and results.

had no aptitude, neither sentiment nor good taste need be expected of him Jovial in all senses of the word, he impressed with magnetism and humour, but delicacy, or even sobriety of judgment, were not in his line. Subtleties of style he despises, and his plots are often wild and incoherent. Thus the man explains his books, and they in turn illustrate the man Autobiographical touches are said to abound in them, notably in (among others) *Louis Lambert* and *Albert Savarus* Balzac's women are held to be particularly admirable, but this seems true only in a very narrow sense Of one side, the "cat-like nature," he had evidently a master's knowledge, with the other he displays no acquaintance at all His real glory is the modernity and actuality of his atmosphere. He found the prose novel restricted practically to but one passion, love, and that usually idealised almost out of recognition. He widened it to be a record of all human activities, and laboured without wearying to make his books a comprehensive record of those activities His writing is no mere vulgar realism, it is writing with a purpose indeed, and that purpose one of heroic proportions Succeeding generations find his books the valuable "documents" he meant them to be, records of marvellous fidelity, always allowing for the gross and earthly and unpoetical mind of their author. Therefore his reputation steadily rises, despite all drawbacks, and his influence on contemporary and on later novelists it were hard to exaggerate, for it can be traced more or less in every important novel that has been written since.

Four years younger than Balzac was Alexandre Dumas Davy de la Pailleterie (1803-70), commonly called the elder Dumas Son of a Royalist general and grandson of a coloured woman, his quadroon blood showed powerfully in Alexandre Dumas Coming early to Paris, he wrote some farces and short stories before achieving fame with his play *Henri Trois* in 1829. A member of the Cénacle, and but one year younger than Hugo, he sympathised with and followed him in drama, and *Henri Trois* was one of the victories in the Romantic campaign He followed this up with other plays, of which *Antony* (1831) and *La tour de Nesle* (1832) were the most remarkable So far Dumas was known mainly as a poet, or rather dramatist. It was not till considerably later that he found his rôle as novelist *Isabelle de Bavière* came out in 1836, and was succeeded by numerous novels of a miscellaneous type *Monte Cristo* came only in 1844, and *Les trois mousquetaires* —first of the immortal series—later in the same year. For the next quarter of a century his name appeared before countless books. He had under-studies, apprentices, collaborators without end. They did the rough work, Dumas added the finishing touches, and signed his name. How much is his, how much the work of his "devils," it were impossible to say. Novels, dramas, books of travel, journalism, poured forth over his signature, and bore the stamp of his marked individuality. He took part in the Revolution of 1848, was exiled for two years under the Empire; aided Garibaldi in Italy during 1860 and following

Dumas

years, married, but separated from his wife almost immediately. After making and spending several fortunes, he died a poor man, leaving one son of the same name and (some think) even greater literary ability, who however does not come within the limits of our notice

Criticism of Dumas

French critics seem to find it difficult to take the elder Dumas seriously M. Brunetière finds no place for him in his admirable *Manual* (1898), which professes to deal with leading writers only Other historians dwell on his dramas, dismissing the novels with a few cold words But surely this is too restricted a view *Monte Cristo* grips the ordinary reader somewhat as *Robinson Crusoe* does. The *Trois mousquetaires* series shows something of the careless riches, the easy vivification, of Scott himself. Dumas is the French Scott—the "author of Waverley" with a difference On him, if on any man, Scott's mantle fell He cocks it on his shoulders with a Gallic grace There is more strut, more pose, the diaphanous naturalness, the wealth of sunny humour, are wanting But there is something of the master's fire, and of his ease of narration Old or young, when we take up a novel by Dumas we are slow to lay it down Above all, the characters live They are not lay figures, but live men and women. Fifty pupils may have drudged at the details, but only their chief adds the vital spark. Without him, they are respectable mediocrities, he touches the leaves, and they live. How much, how little Dumas actually did to some of the novels which bear his name, one neither knows nor greatly cares.

Amusing stories are current about his readiness to sign work done by his "young men" It was a fashion of the time. Even Balzac, if he laboured mightily at his novels, thought nothing of getting four friends to write an act each, with himself, of a drama required immediately. The important thing is that the *cachet*, the sign-manual, of Dumas is unmistakable, it may not be a very artistic quality that he imparts to rough journey-work, but it is his own, and it is alive

His rightful place

An age of introspection and analysis, of rabid self-consciousness and diseased craving for "style," naturally held Dumas cheap. Lovers of Flaubert or George Eliot were not likely to prize the *Three Musketeers* and *Twenty Years After* Time's wheel turns, and we are back once more to the novel of adventure Cloaks and rapiers, masks and ambushes, are in fashion again, laboured perfecting of trifles, philosophic analysis of character, are quite at a discount. So Dumas is avenged of his critics And one cannot wholly regret it His limitations are obvious. Style is a matter of the slightest moment. Intellectual meditation, love or minute description of nature, spiritual aspirations, poetical imagery — these we neither expect nor find in Dumas Instead, we have action. The sword gleams, the horse neighs, and we are ready to spring to saddle with him and take the road again Youth burns in our veins, the world is before us, a gallant and merry and adventurous world. Stern censors may despise such vicarious enthusiasm Nevertheless, Dumas did a large work in his own way, and it seems right to acknowledge it

We cannot all live on manna and honey-dew, we do not all dwell habitually between the peaks of Parnassus. Those who relish country fare, the bread and cheese and Windsor chairs of a village inn, are probably in the majority, and may well claim pabulum to their mind. Dumas fairly earned his position as novelist of the million, besides inspiring with a breath of true Romantic vigour the exceedingly dry bones of psychological or would-be "artistic" story-telling.

George Sand

"George Sand" (Amantine-Lucile-Aurore Dupin, baronne Dudevant, 1804-76), third and youngest of this remarkable trio, was also the most purely Romantic. In her case there can be no doubt about the epithet, her novels are romances, and little more. Born a provincial, she married at eighteen, but separated from her husband after nine years of married life, and lived for the next twenty years mainly in Paris. After that she retired to her childhood's home, and ended her days there in dignified quiet. During the second and third of these periods—as *Parisienne* and as *Châtelaine de Nohant*—she wrote, like her great compeers, enormously. Novels, dramas, miscellaneous articles, an autobiography, and an extensive correspondence, attest her literary industry. Her relations with Musset and Chopin, her later friendship with Lamennais and several less famous politicians, must be noted as bearing on her work. As for anecdotage about her person, her "mannishness" and cigarette-smoking, that hardly belongs to literature. One recalls Mrs Browning's visit to her in Paris, and gladly leaves

one woman-genius to judge another. Her books divide themselves into three periods. *Rose et Blanche*, *Indiana*, *Valentine*, *Lélia*, and *Jacques* (1831 to 1834) belong to her first period of originality and freshness. *Mauprat*, *Spiridion*, *Consuelo*, *Les sept cordes de la lyre*, *La comtesse de Rudolstadt* (1837 to 1844), containing perhaps her best work, are products of her most socially busy years, and bear traces of her intercourse with great minds. The third division comprises her later novels, her rustic studies and notes of travel, the *Histoire de ma vie* (1854-55), and much miscellaneous work. Her total writings fill well over a hundred volumes, and cannot possibly be enumerated here. But the leading characteristics and qualities of her work can be summed up with fair brevity.

Characterisation of her work.

George Sand was a woman and a French woman. Some women are not individual, many are not national, she has no affinity to these. Her personality colours and shapes every page of her writing. Masculine in many tastes, she is essentially feminine in structure; reflective, rather than originative. The loose texture of her books, so different from Balzac's compressed writing, is characteristic. But, above all, the way she looks at everything in relation to herself, is feminine, the grace with which she clothes it, French. George Sand was a poet, though she did not write verse; her novels are lyrical dramas. Thus all the early ones are fierce outcries against marriage, evidently suggested by her own experience; and in form they are little short of dithyrambs. The great novels of the middle period, again,

reflect her political and philosophical studies, her communings with Lamennais and others. The books of her old age breathe of rest and country quiet, and a life from which passion has died out Of course love is her prevailing theme It is passion rather than pure love, and her history and heredity go far to explain this Love being "woman's whole existence," we need not wonder to find it so prominent. Yet in at least one book, *Spiridion*, it has no place. She is called an idealist, Balzac a realist, but neither description is at all exhaustive. George Sand does not so much idealise, as poetise, everything. Scientific observation, experiment, and analysis, are not in her line, she neither sees life steadily, nor sees it whole. But what she does see she puts in the most delightful way, clothing it with colour, delicate as the first flush of morning Even the crudest passion becomes tender and refined And all this because she sees it as part of herself, because in all her views the personal element is never far distant.

Style and shortcomings

George Sand wrote with great ease. Hers was the easy writing which, if it does not always make hard reading, tends to make careless reading Her phrases do not dwell with us, we do not return again and again to her books, lingering over favourite passages. We read them with interest; but the interest is apt to die out when the book is finished Her characters are free-hand sketches rather than living creatures. On the other hand, her spontaneity is one great charm. Nothing can be pleasanter than her prefaces, telling how each book

grew like a flower Her love of nature, and delight in picturing it, are present from the first, and continue or increase to the last Then, with all her heat, she is never bitter, nor—rare merit considering her qualities—at all inclined to be hysterical. Sentimental she certainly is, but this in her is rather a quality than a defect, and stops short of mawkishness. So, though strongly anti-clerical, she is not anti-religious, perhaps her woman's instinct helped her there, even more than her romantic fervour. It must be confessed, however, that the fluid ease of her writing wants more definitely constraining bounds, the river wanders too readily over its banks Her books begin delightfully, but have no proper middle or end, they may be said rather to stop than to end These remarks are general and summary, it would be easy to apply them, to particularise in separate instances. But they may at least indicate the delicate, airy, spiritual, picturesque, poetical atmosphere which always clothes her writing, whatever the theme She sees the soul, even though her shapes be vague and shadowy She revived romance in novels, in a sense in which it had lain dormant ever since *Corinne* Her influence was great, on other nations even more than her own, the zealous artists and strenuous realists who came after her in France could hardly admire her loose rapidity, or her semi-articulate responsiveness, but these found a public elsewhere. On the whole, she well deserves her place in the trio Her *Histoire de ma vie* illustrates both her charm and her negligence, recounting delightfully episodes and

impressions of early childhood at inordinate length, stopping short just when a scientifically composed history would have reached the zenith of its interest

Less than this trio, but a more accomplished artist than any of them, was Prosper Mérimée (1803-70)

Mérimée

Born a year earlier than "George Sand," he was also more precocious, and as early as 1820 became known as a play-writer He held Government appointments of an important nature, was made member of the Academy in 1844, and senator in 1853 His literary work is varied and distinguished History and archæology, the drama and the novel, all yielded him triumphs. His *Théâtre de Clara Gazul* (1825) and *La Guzla* (1827), *Chronique du regne de Charles IX* (1829) and *Histoire de Pèdre I. de Castille* (1848), his *Peintures de Saint-Savin* (1845), with *Colomba*, *Arsène Guillot*, *Carmen* (1840-45), &c, &c, may serve as samples of his work. The last-mentioned will probably prove his most abiding title to fame. His glory is that, along with Gautier (as noted before), he perfected short stories. Of these he left some twenty, the best of which are indeed masterly. His style was ironic, sarcastic, contemptuous of pretence. From the Romantic School he early revolted, retaining, as a French critic has noted, only two qualities in common with them, love of action and love of colour. But of the later Realist school he was equally sceptical His keenly critical mind, indeed, eating away all enthusiasm, preyed

upon itself. His style, like the man himself, became harsher The nemesis of those who live only for art came on his latter days. "For fear of being a dupe he distrusted himself in life, love, science, art; and he was the dupe of his distrust." Losing interest in everything, he sank into torpor and melancholy, possibly not unassisted by misgivings as to his own political position, certainly accentuated by his perception of evil days in store for his country. Even the *Lettres à une inconnue* (first published 1873), though they reveal some touch of human nature, deepen our impression of his sad, bitter, loveless, and ironical disposition. He died in the crisis of France's agony (23rd September 1870), having already seen his darkest misgivings hasten to be realised.

Eugène Sue

Contemporary with George Sand was Marie-Joseph-Eugène Sue (1804-59), another prolific writer, whose *Mystères de Paris* (1842), with *Le Juif errant* (1845), gave him reputation of a kind He had been an army and navy surgeon, served in Spain and at Navarino, wrote some extravagant novels embodying his own experiences, but made his hit with the melodramatic romances mentioned. From a literary point of view he counts for little, one of his later books was condemned by the Courts as seditious and immoral. He ventured into politics, was made a deputy in 1850, went into retreat after the *coup d'état* of 1851, and died in Savoy after several years of absence from Paris and literary interests. It is impossible to omit him from any record of the time, equally impossible to class his

work as more than recreation for idleness, a "substitute for a cigarette or a game of dominoes"

We have omitted to mention Paul de Kock (1794-1871), a predecessor of Sue on even coarser lines; gross, laughter-loving, vulgarly popular.

Janin

Coming back to literature, we find Jules-Gabriel Janin (1804-74), another year-mate of "George Sand" Jules Janin was a man of letters pure and simple, neither politician, nor Government employé, nor man of business He lived by writing, and whatever he wrote was literature. As critic for the *Journal des Débats*, he produced endless columns of delightful matter His theatrical critiques, in particular, imported Romantic colour and freshness into what had been usually arid and technical. They, reprinted as a *Cours de littérature dramatique* (1853-58), form his largest and best work But his stories, *L'Ane mort et la femme guillotinée* (1829), *Barnave* (1831), *Le chemin de traverse* (1837), &c, reveal a subtle, half-mocking, purely Attic humour His translation or rather recomposition of *Clarissa Harlowe* (1846) should also stand to his credit here. He succeeded Sainte-Beuve as Academician in 1870, and no writer was better qualified to speak that great critic's eulogium In his own way, Janin was a critic of nearly equal calibre, while his happy temper and seductive style speak the writer who never made an enemy.

Charles de Bernard (1805-50) is a name to most of slight significance, remembered by Thackeray's eulogium. Retired, gentlemanly, quite a family man,

he wrote pleasant though not irreproachable novels.

Bernard

Gerfaut (1838) is the most remarkable, while of the others *Les ailes d'Icare* (1839-40) may be taken as typical instance of his easy, man of the world style It is a loosely flowing, as well as easy, style; agreeable rather than impressive. In *Gerfaut* alone, unpleasant as much of it is, we find some tragic strength, but usually a light vein of graceful comedy seems what is most safe to be found in his novels.

Alphonse Karr (1808-90) was another writer of much charm, without being great, his books are delightful.

Karr

Sous les tilleuls (1832), a genuinely romantic novel, first made him known, and is pleasant reading to this day A long succession of novels followed, of which *Geneviève* (1838) is perhaps the most outstanding He edited *Figaro* for some time, as also the satirical publication called *Les Guêpes* (1839 to 1847) Alphonse Karr had a keen wit, and his romanticism is far from being either silly or sentimental Of his later work, the *Voyage autour de mon jardin* (1845) is a perennial favourite, while his Reminiscences (*Le livre de bord*) were published in 1879. He lived the last thirty years of his life mostly at Saint-Raphael on the Riviera, where a charming villa perpetuates the memory of one who did much to make that delightful locality known.

Émile Souvestre (1808-64) was known as moralist as well as romancer, and *Un philosophe sous les toits* (1851) is probably his best-known book. Jules San-

deau (1811-83) was a prolific minor novelist, from *Madame de Sommerville* (1834) to *Jean de Thomeray* (1873), as well as a writer of comedy. And now a line must again be drawn. It were useless to multiply names of minor story-tellers, while the great ones next in order—such names as those of Flaubert and the Goncourts, "Erckmann-Chatrian," Dumas *fils*, Jules Verne, and Edmond About, still more Alphonse Daudet and Emile Zola—belong manifestly to a later age In reviewing the history of French novel-writing, it must be remembered to include authors grouped by us under other heads, but who won laurels in this field likewise. Thus Victor Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, Vigny, "Stendhal," Gautier,—equally with Dumas,—are names of capital importance in that history. And the same holds good in other departments Dramatic writing, for example, formed a most important part of the Romantic Triumph The new romantic drama attracted most of the rising talent of the age, and bulks large both in quantity and in excellence of work. But we have already seen what were its leading features, and how writers like Hugo, Dumas, Mérimée, Vigny, Musset, &c., were its principal exponents To take up drama separately and *de novo*, therefore, would involve recapitulating much of what has been already noted. Yet it may be well in a few sentences to summarise the general state of French drama at this time, and mention some names of dramatists which have not found a place on previous pages

Summary transition to drama

Brief vogue of Romantic drama

The romantic drama carried in it seeds of decay. It is curious to see how universally it was taken up by writers of every shade, how all but universally dropped by them in later life, so far at least as serious plays are concerned. The modern spirit does not seem congenial to serious drama. We have seen how little part it played in the English revival, in the French its place is large but temporary. The innovations made by the Romantic playwrights really struck at the root of drama as enjoyed in France. They tended to convert drama into melodrama. The destruction of the unities seemed to carry with it the loss of dramatic form altogether, to critics trained on Corneille and Racine. Nothing was left but a great formless mass, to give interest to which various devices had to be employed. Drama became lyrical, or became symbolical, the latter was the remedy specially favoured by Victor Hugo French audiences endured this for a time. But it went always rather against the grain, and the time came when they kicked The "resounding fall" of Hugo's *Burgraves* in 1843 was accompanied by flattering plaudits showered on an undistinguished work of a new writer, the *Lucrèce* of one François Ponsard (1814-67) Ponsard was a heavy and prosaic writer, rhetorical and tawdry. His later plays, such as *Charlotte Corday* (1850), evince neither poetry nor apt stage-effect. But they were vigorous in a way, and their verse had a Classic sound Ponsard's success fairly drove Hugo from the field, and he abandoned drama, as the public had abandoned him

After this, serious drama was scarcely tried, writers who affected the stage turned their attention to comedy. And in comedy, as we all know, the French stage has long been supreme. their actors and writers both dominated for many years after this date the theatres of Europe.

This judgment of Romantic drama embodies the general verdict of French critics It failed where it was most anxious to succeed, says one, victorious in lyric, it was defeated in tragedy For it had no positive principles, says another, building merely on negation, on defiance of all rules, Classical and other. It adopted Shakespeare's form without his spirit, imagining him a barbarous innovator, instead of a mighty genius who purified and curbed the licence he found "Romantic drama," says M Brunetière, "is a Classic tragedy where the unities may be violated, where the personages may be *simples particuliers*, where the grotesque mingles ever with the sublime." There is manifest truth in these strictures Hugo himself maintained a natural unity, but some of his followers threw this to the winds And the vice of a preconceived system flaws even Hugo's work. His characters are symbols, not men and women. They talk their author's language, repeat his views like a lesson. And they are symbols of contradiction. Antithesis is pushed beyond nature. It is right to insist, as against the Classicists, that human beings are complex, but wrong to build a "system" on this. Drama cannot be written to order; *system* it abhors. It must be

Inherent drawbacks

spontaneous, and above all real. Hugo's manufactured clowneries, says some one, chill passion instead of leading up to it like Shakespeare's. One can have a surfeit even of passion and crime On the whole, one cannot but feel that the great Romanticists owed their measure of success in drama to their own greatness, rather than their cherished "system." It would be presumptuous to dispute this, in the face of such a consensus of opinion. But the best proof that that opinion is right will perhaps be found in the fact that the leaders themselves so soon abandoned their attempt, and—as in Sainte-Beuve's and Hugo's Academic discourses — recanted in large measure the heresies of their youth. Madame Rachel's astonishing success in reviving Racine (1838-45) doubtless played its part in opening their eyes.

We must not, however, suppose that the "Romantic" attempt wholly monopolised the stage. That attempt was at its height in 1825-30. But from the beginning of the 'Twenties other writers had made essays, less systematic, but perhaps more natural Thus Pierre Lebrun (1785-1873) produced his *Marie Stuart* (1820), a distinct attempt after Schiller The year before, Jacques-Arsène-François-Polycarpe Ancelot (1794-1854) had given the stage his *Louis IX.* (1819), in rivalry to his fellow-townsman Delavigne's *Vêpres siciliennes* (ante, p. 197). The *Sylla* (1821) of Victor-Josef-Étienne Jouy (1769-1842), and the *Clytemnestre* (1822) and *Jeanne d'Arc* (1825) of Alexandre Soumet (1788-1845), were

Rival dramatists

further attempts in the same line Pierre-Marie-Thérèse-Alexandre Guiraud (1788-1847) followed suit with his *Maccabees*, *Count Julian* (both 1822), and other pieces. Jules-Georges Ozanaux (1795-1852), besides a musical drama on *Le dernier jour de Missolonghi* (1828), produced such tragedies as *La perouse* (1829) and *Le nègre* (1830), before abandoning the stage for more serious work. These writers, each according to his bent, did much to pave the way for the Romantics, though even in 1829, when Vigny produced his *Othello*, the Parisian public still hooted down mention of the famous "handkerchief." And these with writers such as Delavigne continued to dispute possession of the stage with the Romantics, till cowed for a time by the latter's vigorous onslaught. Only the dramatic student, however, will care to trace the career of such secondary playwrights. He will do well to consult M. Charpentier's *Théâtre* (6 vols., 1876-78), a mine of information on such matters. We may be content to turn at once to the vigorous if not always refined school of comedy which flourished, in several shapes, side by side with the rival attempts of the Romantics and their adversaries.

Comedy Scribe

On the ruin of Romantic drama was built a new form of semi-serious play, allied to comedy rather than to its opposite, which is our only substitute for full-dress tragedy nowadays. This movement, in France as in England, began rather after our period, and is associated on the French stage with the names of Émile Augier (1820-89) and Dumas *fils* (1824-95). But during our entire period Comedy

flourished in various forms There was the *comédie historique* of Dumas *père* and others; the comedy of manners in which French art has always been great; mixed comedy, farces, "vaudevilles," and what not Of all these the great manufacturer, during the first half of the Century, was Augustin-Eugène Scribe (1791-1861). Beginning early, he soon established a veritable manufactory, where—like novelists under Dumas—young aspirants wrought under his directions, and left him the whole credit. Thus *Adrienne Lecouvreur* (1849), perhaps his greatest success, was executed by the younger Legouvé under his eye To enumerate Scribe's works were impossible indeed, or rather the works turned out in his school. At a venture may be named *Michel et Christine* (1820) *Valérie* (1822), *Le mariage de raison* (1826), *Le mariage d'argent* (1827), *La camaraderie* (1837), *Le verre d'eau* (1840), *Une bataille des dames* (1851). Scribe is simply a playwright To poetry, satire, sentiment, literature in any form, he hardly pretends. His plays are made to act, and if they act well he is satisfied. On all points of stage management he is infallible Yet these plays, such as they are, procured for their author admission to the Academy in 1836 Villemain, who received him, extolled the ingenious and delicate art, the truth to nature, and the happy manner, of his chief works; and for the rest of his days Scribe enjoyed a seat among the Immortals.

A predecessor of Scribe's, still alive during the earlier years of our period, was Louis-Benoit Picard (1769-1828), comedian and satirist Another was

Other writers of Comedy

Népomucène Lemercier (1771-1840), a clever and humorous writer, originator of the term *comédie historique*. Contemporary with Scribe we find less-known writers like Casimir Bonjour (1795-1856), author of *La mère rivale* (1821), *Les deux cousines* (1823), &c., Adolf J. S Empis (1795-1868) and Edouard-Josef-Ennemond Mazères (1796-1866), who wrote in combination *La mère et la fille* (1830), and many other plays singly or in partnership; Charles-Camille Doucet (1812-95), director of beaux arts, and so forth. None of these names are distinguished, and the student may again be referred to such books as Charpentier's. But once more he may be reminded that the names which really shed lustre on this field of letters are the same which we have had to mention so many times already. Hugo, Dumas, Balzac, Musset, Gautier, are the important writers here again Delavigne, too, tried his hand at comedy as at tragedy, as noted early in this chapter. And many writers of less mark, but still whose best work was done in other regions, wrote one or more sparkling comedies by way of recreation. To the end of our period, however, it is true to say that Comedy was but a rival to Tragedy, not its supplanter. Since then, since *Gabrielle* (1849) by Augier, and *La dame aux camélias* (1852) by the younger Dumas, the rising tide has been all in one direction. Comedy, farce, operetta, opera-bouffe, have fairly ousted serious drama. In these lighter walks French artists are unequalled, as English theatres in particular have not been slow to acknowledge by copious borrowing.

And now about the dramatic performance of this time, in comedy and in tragedy, enough, or even more than enough, has probably been said

Writers of criticism

Criticism of all kinds, more especially poetical criticism, made great strides during this period Sainte-Beuve, Jules Janin, Gautier, "Stendhal," Victor Hugo himself, have been mentioned as conspicuous leaders in criticism as in original work, some names of specialists may now be added to this list. Alexandre Rodolphe Vinet (1797-1847), a Swiss divine and philosopher, may fairly come here in virtue of his *Études sur Pascal* (1848), and his histories of French literature in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries (1849-53). Many of his books, theological or other, have appeared in English form, compare especially *Studies in Pascal* (1859), and *Outlines of Philosophy and Literature* (1865) Jean-Jacques-Antoine Ampère (1800-64) was a learned philologist, deeply read in German and Oriental languages, and wrote a *Histoire littéraire de la France* (1840), which comes down only to the twelfth Century, but was continued by Le Clerc, Fauriel, and others, also a work on the *Formation de la langue française* (1841), and much beside. He was deservedly elected Academician in 1847. François Saint-Marc Girardin (1801-73), professor and leader-writer, is known by his *Cours de littérature dramatique* (1843), and also wrote *Souvenirs d'un journaliste* (1859), &c. Maximilien-Paul-Émile Littré (1801-81), author of the famous Dictionary (1863-72), was in his youth a fiery Radical, fighting on the barricades in 1830 and

in the columns of the *National* during Louis-Philippe's reign, and also a devoted disciple of Comte (for whom see the end of this chapter). He translated Strauss (1839-40) and Pliny's Natural History (1848), rendered Book I of the Iliad into old French (1847), and wrote freely on philology and philosophy. Radical and positivist he remained to the end, and was solemnly condemned by the Academy in consequence But his chief works, and the events of his later life, fall rather outside our province.

Joubert, and others

As we have returned to didactic writing, this seems an opportunity to mention the *Pensées* of Joseph Joubert (1754-1824), printed in 1838. A critic of high standing, and influential in his own circle, Joubert published nothing during life, and the volume named above was edited from his papers, fourteen years after his death, by his friend Chateaubriand. It fully vindicated the high place claimed for its author, and is well known to English readers by the critical account of Matthew Arnold. Here too may be named Jules Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire (1805-95), the immensely learned editor of Aristotle (1837-87) and other works, and Étienne Vacherot (1809-97), philosophical professor at the Sorbonne, author of *De Rationis Auctoritate* (1836), a *Histoire critique de l'école d'Alexandrie* (1846-50), *La métaphysique et les sciences* (1858), *La religion* (1868), &c Contemporary with these, again, was Jean-Marie-Napoléon-Desiré Nisard (1806-84), whose *Manifeste contre la littérature facile* (1833), and still more his *Histoire de la littérature française* (1844-49),

are specially interesting to us as being violently anti-Romantic in tone The latter work, remarkable as the first complete history of French literature written in our Century by one man, is in effect a continuous attack on Romantic ideas. Its publication must have helped the rebellion against Romanticism, but obviously the views expressed in it had matured in the author's mind during the whole period of Romantic ascendancy. Later instalments of this book appeared down to 1861.

Publicists

The publicists of the time must not be forgotten Journalism, education, and *belles lettres*—criticism and production—ran so much into each other that it is not easy to keep the threads separate. Armand Carrel (1800-36), and his death in a duel, have been incidentally mentioned before. That tragic event robbed the *National* of an editor, and literature of a promising recruit, as is proved by the last volume of his *Œuvres* (posthumously published, 1858), edited by Nisard and Littré, and reviewed in a well-known dissertation by John Stuart Mill His antagonist, Émile de Girardin (1806-71), editor of *La Presse*—to be distinguished from the Saint-Marc-Girardin recently named—was referred to in passing as an occasional dramatist. Somewhat junior to these were Louis Veuillot (1813-83), ultramontane editor of the *Univers*, and Jules Simon (1814-96), in later days editor of the *Siècle*. Consideration of their maturer works must be deferred to next volume, but they may be noted here as eager press-writers in their youth. The latter was also a philosophical writer

and lecturer, making his début in this field with an *Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie* (1844-45). It is tempting to mention under the head of journalism the names of Edmond Scherer (1815-89) and Francisque Sarcey (1828-99). But their newspaper days came after 1850, and their independent works belong clearly to that later generation. Similar considerations of chronology forbid including here the work of Eugène Fromentin (1820-76), critic and travel-writer, Ernest Rénan (1823-92), Henri [Hippolyte-Adolphe] Taine (1828-93), and many others who may have made their first appearance before our period closes, but whose completed work must be left to be dealt with as a whole in the volume succeeding this.

Turning from journalism and literary criticism, we have to take note of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-65), author of the famous dictum "Property is theft" Born in humble circumstances, Proudhon forced his way up without recourse to the usual method of newspaper work, though in after-years he was proprietor of several periodicals. Nor does he seem to have been a pupil of Saint-Simon or Fourier (*ante*, p. 213), though doubtless acquainted with their writings. In 1840 he wrote *Qu'est-ce que la propriété* for a prize offered by the Academy of Besançon, and followed this up by the more complete *Système des contradictions économiques* (1846) In 1848 he took part in the Revolution, was thrown into prison, and utilised his experience in *Confessions d'un révolutionnaire* (1849). His later exploits, the newspapers he founded, the Socialist

Proudhon

bank which failed, his imprisonments, exile, and amnesty, hardly belong to literature In his writings, Proudhon first reveals that "anarchist" trend of thought which has since become so common. Existing institutions are to be destroyed, that men may be left free to become moral and virtuous without compulsion The ideas of Shelley seem born again in this unpoetical mind. On the constructive side, Proudhon was far from being what we now call a Socialist, and he was quite ready to accept the Second Empire, if it offered hopes of carrying out some of his ideas. He founded no school, permanently influenced few disciples But his general influence, during his lifetime, was considerable and unsettling. His published works are said to occupy thirty-seven volumes, his correspondence fourteen, but it is not likely that these contain much of permanent interest. His style, however, was incisive and not without literary merit, he criticised freely, books as well as men In the general chaos of 1848-50, literary as political, he played no inconsiderable part, and it would be a mistake to lose sight of him in estimating the forces of the time

With Proudhon may be coupled another socialist, or at least socialistic writer, Jean-Joseph-Louis Blanc (1811-82). Son of a French official at Madrid, he came to Paris a young man His first work, the *Organisation du travail* (1840), was eagerly read by the working classes; and his *Histoire de dix ans* (1841-46) was an event in the campaign against Louis-Philippe. After taking part in the

Louis Blanc

Revolution of 1848 he escaped to London, and there wrote most of his *Histoire de la révolution française*, of which the first volume had appeared in 1847, while the twelfth and last came out in 1862. Only after the fall of the Second Empire did he return to Paris, where he played a considerable part in politics for the next ten years. Louis Blanc was a bright and attractive, though far from impartial, writer. His *Lettres sur l'Angleterre* (1861-64) give a good idea of his style as a journalist, and may be read with amusement as well as profit still.

Several members of the "Mennaisian School" (*ante*, p. 201) attained independent and great distinction. Two of these, Lacordaire and Montalembert, accompanied Lamennais to Rome in 1831, and stood beside Lamartine in the crisis of 1848. Jean-Baptiste-Henri-Dominique Lacordaire (1802-61) was more orator than writer. Sceptic in youth, he embraced Catholicism under the influence of Lamennais, and remained faithful when his master left it, assuming the Dominican order about 1840. But he remained also true to his conception of Christian democracy, and enforced his ideas in sermons or "conférences" during nearly twenty years. He also wrote a *Vie de Saint Dominique* (1840). Of his fiery eloquence few traces are left. It built on sentiment rather than thought, and was neither artistically chiselled nor imbued with his master's vein of poetry. But it penetrated and moved. Lacordaire, says one historian, was as great a

Lacordaire.

Romantic in the pulpit as Lamennais in his writings He sat for a short time in the Assembly, was member for a brief period of the Academy, but his great work was preaching, and the asceticism of his life added weight to his words. Though his *Œuvres complètes* (1857) fill nine volumes, they poorly represent the mighty influence which was so potent during the latter half of our period. for that we must go to the chronicles of the time

Associated with Lacordaire were Pierre-Antoine Berryer (1790-1868), the Cicero of the Bar, whose speech was "less a talent than a power", the père de Ravignan (1795-1858), first lawyer, latterly Jesuit; the Abbé Félix Dupanloup (1802-78), afterwards well known as Bishop of Orleans But these names, great in their day, have no weight in our literary scales It is otherwise with Charles-Forbes-René, Comte de Montalembert (1810-70), who also peculiarly interests us as being at least half English. Son of an *émigré* nobleman who married an English wife, young Montalembert went to school first at Fulham, and visited Ireland in 1830 Aiding Lamennais in starting the *Avenir*, and sharing the memorable journey to Rome, he afterwards retired to Germany, where he wrote his first book, *Histoire de Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie* (1836), followed by *Du vandalisme et du catholicisme dans l'art* (1839) Before this he had broken with Lamennais, but with Lacordaire he was firm friend to the last. During the reign of Louis-Philippe he was a prominent member of the Opposition, fighting for Christian education, and

Montalembert

always adhering to his cherished motto, "God and Liberty" After 1848 he supported Louis-Napoleon, to be disillusioned by the *coup d'état* Aged forty-two, he withdrew from public life, and devoted himself thereafter mainly to his great book, *The Monks of the West* (1860-67, English translation by Mrs Oliphant, afterwards his biographer). Tranquil years of preparation by reading and travel were interrupted once by a trial for sedition on account of his articles on England (1858) in a newspaper, from which ordeal he emerged defeated but triumphant He also published *Une nation en deuil* (Poland), 1861, *L'église libre dans l'état libre*, 1863, *Le pape et la Pologne*, 1864. His pen was ever at the service of oppressed nationalities, Irish, Polish, or Greek At his own great work he laboured to the end, and it is worthy of his generous if not critical zeal His latest writing was on the subject of Papal Infallibility (1870), on which, as in all other controversies of his life, he took the side which seemed to make for religious liberty, reverence, and zeal not political ultramontanism

Contemporary with Montalembert was Georges-Maurice de Guérin (1810-39), who during his short life made no figure in the world, but left a volume of *Reliquiæ* (first published 1860), containing charming notes from a journal kept at Chesnaie when a student under Lamennais, and a prose-poem, "The Centaur," highly praised by Sainte-Beuve for a species of mystical pantheism. His elder sister Eugénie (1805-48) left journals and letters, which have been translated into English, and obtained a

The Guérins

measure of popularity by the good offices of Matthew Arnold. But, with the best of will, it is difficult to see in either of the Guérins more than a certain hectic beauty, an inchoate promise but doubtfully indicating any assurance of riper execution.

Ozanam

An abler follower of the Mennaisian school was Antoine-Frédéric Ozanam (1813-53), Professor at the Sorbonne, and a founder of the Society of St Vincent de Paul. Though too early cut off, Ozanam had shown, by his lectures on foreign literature, as by his *Études sur Dante* (1839), *Histoire de la civilisation au cinquième siècle* (1845), *Études germaniques* (1849), and other books, very rare powers both of attainment and of imparting He lectured, says an auditor, like a man inspired. Singularly bright and attractive in manner, he yet impressed most of all by the sense of religious fervour which dominated him Teachers like this leave their mark, and amid all the welter of opinion in France, the changeful currents and whirling eddies of a time of disquiet and transition, it will be seen that the Mennaisian school, by the mouth of these distinguished adherents, exercised a spiritual influence which did much to counteract strong disintegrating forces and impulses.

Women-writers

The mention of Eugénie de Guérin reminds us that few names of women-writers have been recorded in this chapter. If it were allowed to cite the mistresses of salons, the ladies who were literary in conversation as well as in writing, a considerable list could be made out. Women like Madame Sophie Gay, her daughter Madame

de Girardin, Madame Desbordes-Valmore, or the famous Madame Swetchine, friend of Lacordaire and Montalembert, played no inconsiderable part in literary society, besides leaving a certain amount of original work behind them But on the whole their claim to be remembered rests on themselves rather than their writings, and with the single exception of "George Sand" no woman-author of real importance comes to the front during the whole period of our survey.

later historians

In the department of history, the most important names have been already given. Of those who came forward later in our period three may be selected. François-Auguste-Alexis Mignet (1796-1884) was a fellow-student of Thiers, a contributor to the *Courrier français*, and a Government official; and became an Academician in 1836. He wrote on the *Spanish Succession* (1836-42), *Antonio Perez and Philip II.* (1845), Mary Stuart (1851), &c, besides an early sketch of the French Revolution (1824) Edgar Quinet (1803-75), a Swiss-French writer, translated Herder's *Philosophy of History* as early as 1825, wrote poems and an answer to Strauss (1838), and from 1839 onwards delivered at Lyons a remarkable series of lectures published as *Du génie des religions* (1842). After that he took to Paris and politics, fought in the Revolution of 1848, sat in the Assembly till the *coup d'état*, was exiled during the Second Empire, came back after Sédan, and was conspicuous during the siege of Paris As a writer Quinet is religious yet anti-clerical, poetic and even

prophetic, but the man was greater than his books. His *Epopées françaises* (1831) is well thought of by good authorities. Other works are *Le christianisme et la révolution* (1846), *Les révolutions d'Italie* (1848), *Les esclaves* (1853), &c. Quinet was a friend of Michelet, and joined him in his energetic attack on the Jesuits His letters to Michelet (published 1884-86), and indeed all his various volumes of *Correspondance*, are perhaps more readable than his longer works His Life and Memoirs have appeared in several forms.

Tocqueville

The third of these, Alexis-Charles-Henri Clérel de Tocqueville (1805-59), was an important writer on political history, and had intimate relations with England, shown in his *Conversations and Correspondence with Nassau Senior* (published 1872). Called to the Bar in 1825, he was sent out six years later on a Commission to the States, and wrote *Democracy in America* (1835), a work of striking merit. Visiting England soon after, he was warmly welcomed by leading Whigs, and married an English wife. As Deputy in 1839, he held a middle course, and became (1849) vice-president and foreign minister A strong opponent of Louis Napoleon, he retired from politics after the *coup d'état*, and produced his second great book, *L'ancien régime et la révolution* (1856). Most of his other work is fragmentary, such as a sketch of the reign of Louis XV. (1846-50), *Le droit au travail* (1848), *Œuvres inédites* (1860), *Souvenirs* (1893). But his two great works are sufficient monument. Their clear style, impersonal disinterestedness of statement,

philosophic analysis, and lofty moralising, remain a model for succeeding writers. Some of his theories may be disproved by events, but the general tone of his books represents the modern spirit in its pure beginnings, and no recent historian fails to own him as master.

Were completeness an object, many more names might be added, as, for instance, in connection with de Tocqueville those of Pellegrino Rossi (1787-1848), Professor of Political Economy and French Ambassador at Rome, or the third Duc de Broglie (1785-1870), Liberal politician and prime minister under Louis-Philippe, both of whom were known as writers. But we have confined our attention to leading and representative names, pre-eminent in a literary sense. One such has been kept to the last, both as standing by itself, and as in many ways summing up and representing the whole forces of the period. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) may indeed not unfairly be called a mirror of the conflicting tendencies which we have seen struggling against each other in the France of our survey, and it is not without significance that he was a friend of men so diverse as Victor Hugo, Lamennais, Augustin Thierry, and Saint-Simon. His independence and revolutionary zeal, his readiness to break with the past yet veneration for great men of that past; his admiration of the Roman Church as a social and political, not as a spiritual, organisation; his clearness and method and order and precision; above all, the completeness and symmetry of his system of the sciences—all bespeak him typical

Comte

of his medley time. If we cannot regard him as a literary force of the first rank, we may at least feel that he was a most important writer, and one whose impress on his age was of the widest and deepest. When it is said that his *Cours de philosophie positive* came out from 1830 to 1842, and the *Système* in the years immediately following 1850, we have sufficiently indicated his chronological place. His private life needs no record, being made up of teaching and writing, the former often under difficulties due to the suspicion his views excited. Toward the end of his career he was entirely without means, and was supported by the contributions of some English friends and admirers.

System is dear to every well-regulated French mind. But Comte's was the most gigantic attempt at system ever made even in France. He dreamed of no less than methodising the whole course of all the sciences, establishing a formula which should cover all possible workings of the human mind. Man's thought, he held, inevitably passes through three stages —theological, metaphysical, scientific or "positive." As with the race, so with the individual. Some twisting was required to make facts square with this theory, just as Hugo had done in the case of poetry. But Comte never allowed facts to stand in the way of his generalisations. As he advanced in years, he became more bigoted and unable to bear contradiction. His best disciples were cast off, because they did not follow him unhesitatingly. He grew more autocratic, more peremptory, more opposed to anything like private

His system

judgment or the free exercise of thought. He would fain have drilled mankind into obedience, making himself the "Supreme Pontiff" of humanity Into the wild aberrations of his later books we need not enter. They are a sad revelation of what may come to a mind cased in self-trust, and regarding its own ideas as veritable inspirations. But the two great works mentioned above came from a brain still working sanely as well as strongly, and must be further considered in themselves and in their influence upon his age.

His great work

The Romantics had no great zeal for science. While all thought was honoured by them, the scientific temper was probably that form of thought with which they had least kinship. The change to Naturalism was largely a recoil from unscientific method. Towards 1850, says a French historian, men's minds dried up, they lost all creeds but that of science Dried up, perhaps; but partly because tired of mere fluid talk about destiny and the infinite Give us something definite, they asked, something we can feel solid amid this shifting flux of emotion Comte directed this desire wisely. Instead of the *ego* of the Romanticists, he held up the social order, instead of psychology, sociology. He did in philosophy what Balzac did for the novel. Observation of others, instead of detailed study of one's own feelings; and in ethics, altruism instead of egotism. This work he did splendidly. We owe to him the very words "altruism" and "sociology." How deeply his teaching has sunk, in France as in England—though we may claim to have appreciated him before his own

countrymen did—a glance at French criticism will show. The latest theories regard its social character as the glory of modern literature While Romanticism was *subjective*, explaining everything by itself; and Naturalism *objective*, losing itself in the thing studied, —modern writing claims to be synthetic, to deal with facts instead of arbitrarily divided fragments of fact The self-surrender which Lamennais found only in Christianity, Comte extended to the whole world of thought. It is only by forgetting yourself in contemplation of the whole that true virtue, true knowledge, or true art can be attained.

To have inaugurated a change like this is work enough for any thinker. We can forget his faults, forget to smile at his extravagance, or resent his self-sufficiency. Comte's own love of science did not last Reversing his own formula, he became less scientific as life advanced, more metaphysical and even theological. Latterly he displayed plus-quam-priestly intolerance, while his own thought ran to a kind of pseudo-religious mysticism, ready to abolish all independent thinking, and to destroy the very records of the steps by which he had attained his own conclusions. But the great work of his manhood stands unaffected by these vagaries It summed up and reduced to clearness the vague thought and wild generalisations of his ablest contemporaries It substituted for these a method of masterly precision, a formula as suggestive and comprehensive as the "development" of Darwin himself. As that gave a new idea of the working of the universe, so this gave a

Its abiding value

new view of the progress of humanity. It fixed attention irrevocably on the social organism, instead of on the mere units which compose it That step, once taken, cannot be retraced All subsequent French thought bears the impress of Comte. His "hierarchy of the sciences" may be revised, remodelled in detail but the *lucidus ordo* of his central conception is a possession for ever, an unretractable gift to France and to the world.

Conclusion

We have thus run through, however hurriedly and imperfectly, the characteristics of a time which one is fain to consider second in European importance only to that covered by the great corresponding movement in our own literature. During this period France gained much, if she lost something; she borrowed from other nations, she also lent back their own with interest. What is the net result? Her borrowings were mostly from Northern literature, from Scandinavia, Germany, Great Britain Italy and Spain contributed a few ideas, philosophical, historical, or literary, and a large amount of Romantic costume and entourage. To ourselves, her largest debt is connected with the names of Scott and Byron; the Hugonian worship of Shakespeare resulted, after all, in little more than a first inspiration, a tendency to lawlessness and the heroic, or perhaps rather the gigantesque To Germany her debt was greater. From Teutonic sources came the chief "motives" which we associate with the Romantic Movement But what seems most striking is the way in which

she made these borrowings her own. Never content with mere copying, French literature absorbs ideas from other races, passes them through the crucible of her own thought, and they come forth re-cast with her image and superscription. Even the great Romantic impulse of Goethe and Schiller is translated into methods of her own. French clearness, French precision, French logic and arrangement and rapidity of summation, mould into quite new shapes what came to her somewhat uncouth and formless. Hence there is continual pleasure to students in examining her transformations, hence the very nations that lent are the richer for what she returns to them The year 1850 marks the end of one such transaction With the expulsion, or rather with the death, of Louis Philippe a page of history seems closed. France had still much to learn She had still to stumble through the slough of Realism to the firmer ground of "Social" literature. But one lesson had been learned, one influence fully absorbed, and it is that lesson and that absorption which give supreme interest to the period we have considered in these pages.

Influence of French writers

What did France give in return? That is also a question not without interest In previous generations her ascendancy had been complete. During the reigns of Frederick the Great in Prussia, George II. in England, her place had been that of acknowledged arbitress. Nothing of this kind exists during our period. She is more recipient than inspirer. Yet, even so, how great is the influence of her method and technique! Lamartine and Hugo in

poetry, Hugo and Balzac and George Sand in fiction, Sainte-Beuve and others in criticism, Lamennais and his followers in church matters, Comte in pure thought—what potent spells these names represent through the whole of European civilisation! In our own literature — excepting only poetry, where we neither needed nor greatly valued impulses, which after all lose most of their force when they leave the language of their birth — how great is our debt to authors such as those named, not so much for initial suggestion, as for helpful and forceful and lucid exposition! If no longer the leader of thought (as indeed she could only have been in a period so formal and trim-cut as the latter half of the Eighteenth Century), France was still the workshop of ideas, the theatre on whose stage experiments were most brilliantly carried out. Alike in her aspirations and her limitations, French gave an object-lesson of the very greatest value, and the literary student will hardly find the lessons of Romantic Triumph summed up in more pregnant and instructive form elsewhere than in the pages of French prose and verse during this period.

Causes of gratitude

The year 1850, as has been said, marks the end of a period in France. To the Second Empire we at least owe this debt, that its harsh repression drove back to literature many who had been tempted into the more difficult and less repaying paths of politics, not to say demagogism. It is as though some stern ordinance had compelled our Disraelis and Macaulays, our Grotes and Thirlwalls

and Mills, not to spend upon party what was meant for mankind Europe was the gainer, if France was the loser Guernsey and Brussels, London and Geneva, made homes for those whom France could not hold; and European letters were fructified by forces which might have expended their energy in the strife of the Assembly or the stagnation of the Academy.

Passage to Germany

We need not expect to find, in each national literature, periods so well marked and so definitely progressive as we have found in the literatures of our own country and of France But as the solidarity of European literature is a fundamental postulate of this series, it behoves us now to study the Romantic Triumph as it showed itself in other nations of the European family. And first let us turn to that literature from which, as we have already seen, both France and England derived in large measure their first Romantic impulse, and to which, when they imparted some of their fervour and study of antiquity and love of freedom, they were but repaying a debt which the leading thinkers of each have been proud to acknowledge.

CHAPTER V.

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN GERMANY

INTRODUCTORY — MEN AND DATES — GOETHE'S OLD AGE — HIS KINGLY PLACE — ROMANTIC LEADERS — AUGUST SCHLEGEL — FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL—THEIR TEACHING—RELIGIOUS PREPOSSESSION—POPULAR APPROVAL—TIECK—HOFFMANN—FOUQUÉ—YOUNGER WRITERS—KERNER—UHLAND—ZENITH OF ROMANTICISM—PATRIOTIC POETRY—DRAMA—AUSTRIAN POETS—CENTRAL GROUP—PROSE WRITING—RICHTER—THE GERMAN NOVEL—SOME MINOR NOVELISTS—CRITICS—JOURNALISTS—SCHOLARS—HISTORY NIEBUHR—NIEBUHR'S METHOD—AND RESULTS—SUCCESSORS TO NIEBUHR—JURISCONSULTS—PHILOSOPHY. SCHELLING—HIS ATTITUDE—HEGEL—PERSONALITY—INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL—RIGHT AND LEFT WINGS—SCIENCE—THEOLOGY SCHLEIERMACHER—HIS TEACHING—HIS SCHOOL—GENERAL RESULTS—YOUNG GERMANY—HEINE: HIS WORK—EFFECTS OF ILL HEALTH—HIS METHOD—FLOUTS AND JEERS—FAITH IN THE IDEAL—NEVER A FIGHTER—MODERN SPIRIT—UNIQUE RESULT—EFFECT OF HIS WORK—FELLOW-WRITERS—FREILIGRATH—OTHER SINGERS—LATER PROSE. AUERBACH AND FREYTAG—STRUWWELPETER—CRITICS—HISTORY AND THEOLOGY—PHILOSOPHY SCHOPENHAUER—PHYSICAL SCIENCE—CONCLUSION.

Introductory

FROM the Fatherland, more than from any other source, the Romantic Movement had originally spread over Europe It is natural therefore to anticipate that, in Germany, during the

same forty years or thereabouts to which our attention is limited, we shall find this Movement in a more advanced stage of development[1] Its inception had been earlier, its progress might well have been greater in proportion, apart from any question of better prepared or more congenial soil. Add that in Germany criticism has usually accompanied, where it has not even antedated, production Lessing and Herder, Goethe and Schiller, were great critics as well as creators Whatever they did was done with a clear knowledge of their aim, there was no blind rush, no semi-conscious inarticulate rapture German literature stands perhaps alone in this—alone even when Greece is taken into account—that its best work is heralded and commented on and explained by a fully ripened exegesis We may expect, therefore, to find not only that the Romantic Movement is further advanced than in France or even England, but that it is better understood its limits and lessons have been more accurately defined Yet, in spite of all this, it will probably appear that the forty years from 1810 to 1850 may fairly be called, in Germany as in

[1] Godeke, *Grundriss der Dichtung*, vol vii (Part I only yet published, Berlin, 1898) Kluge, *Geschichte der deutschen National Litteratur* (Altenburg, 1895) Haym, *Die romantische Schule* (Berlin, 1869). Hettner, *Die romantische Schule* (Brunswick, 1850) Julian Schmidt, *Geschichte der Romantik*, 2 vols (Leipzic, 1850), *Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur seit Lessings Tod*, 3 vols (Leipzic, 1858). On Heine, besides books mentioned in text, compare—*Life* by Stigand, 2 vols (London, 1875); *Life*, by Sharp (*Great Writers* series, 1887) *Last Days of Heine*, by Camille Selden ("*La Mouche*," Paris, 1884, English translation, 1898) Matthew Arnold, *Essays in Criticism*. &c., &c, &c.

the other two countries, the period of Romantic Triumph.

Men and dates

In 1810 Schiller was already dead Goethe had still over twenty years of magnificent old age before him Richter had done his best work, but was still writing books unlike any one else's. Voss was Professor at Heidelberg, and now publishing only translations. Fichte and Jacobi survived, but must be regarded as belonging to the previous era; while Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer fall within our survey "Novalis" (Friedrich von Hardenberg) was gone, but the Schlegels, Tieck, and Uhland remained in full force. Heine was eleven years old. The brothers Humboldt were actively at work, the brothers Grimm were just on the point of issuing their Tales Niebuhr had not quite reached, Schleiermacher but little overpassed, middle age Oken and Gauss were rising luminaries of science. This will give some idea of the epoch where our study begins, the chief names which it will include. We have to do, not with a nascent literature, but with one already in full power. Our notion of the Romantic Triumph need not restrict itself to writers usually classed as the "Romantic School" of poets Even after Goethe and Schiller had done their work, there remained room for a development which should be more distinctively Romantic than any but their earlier writings showed. Both began as revolutionaries, but passed on to accept literary orthodoxy of a kind, to rest in traditions which themselves at least described as Classical Their predominant power

prevented challenge of their canons, compelled acceptance for a time of their code of exemptions and restrictions. It was only after they were withdrawn that tendencies which had long stirred German writers, which had operated in these two master-singers themselves and had spread, largely through their example, to other nations of Europe, were left to pursue their natural course, to work out their way unhindered in a generation no longer tyrannised over by the irresistible sway of pre-eminent genius.

Goethe's lifework belongs to the volume preceding ours But he was not yet an extinct volcano His *West-östliche Divan*, published in 1814, shows unabated lyric power, and set German poets off on a new tack The last part of *Wilhelm Meister* appeared in 1821, the second part of *Faust* so late as 1831 These last were important works, if less transcendently so than fervid admirers claim. In both, to an unbiassed view, symbolism surely overrides beauty or grandeur. Intricate parables leave us cold, we may admire, but do not feel Those who prize a cryptic message may seek their gospel in these riddling mazes, lovers of poetry and imagination will be apt to feel starved. They resent the too obvious allegory of the later *Faust*, kick against the obtruded didactic of Euphorion and the Homunculus. Many of us would rather that Part I had remained alone We could have divined a moral for ourselves, without having it preached through pages of tiresome metaphysic. This ambitious life-drama, on which its author had lavished thought and

Goethe's old age

labour through his own life, might have fared better if finished earlier Some coldness of age dulls the flash of its diamond-work, fancy drudges at the menial task of prelection The end of all comes with a shock of bathos Gretchen's lover finishing as a sort of model squire may be harmonious with fact, but scarcely with the supernatural machinery set in motion by his choice Wilhelm Meister, again, is a less lifelike and homogeneous character than of old This last record of him—either in its first form, or in a still more diffuse recast issued in 1824—is rather a medley of fragments than a completed whole. Wise things there are in it plentifully, of course, as also things tender, things humorous, deep and gentle touches of humanity But on the whole, in both *Faust* and the *Wander-Jahre*, taking a broad view, it is Goethe the thinker, the philosopher, the sage and prophet of Weimar, whom we perceive working the strings of his puppets, the creative artist, the maker of real poems, live men and women, is but rarely to be seen.

Yet both books were great in their way, and greatly impressed their readers. *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, too, that semi-historic, fanciful, pleasantly gossiping record of his life and thought, came out at intervals from 1811 onward In *Kunst und Alterthum*, a periodical started by himself, he wrote much between 1816 and 1828, uttering his latest critical views. And the *Conversations* with Eckermann, so often quoted in previous pages, show the old man full of ripe wisdom and interest in what went on. During these twenty-odd years he sat at Weimar, a patriarch

His kingly place

or demigod of letters, impressing all visitors with a sense of something superhuman Heine, we know, thought him worthy to be Jove himself, and "looked instinctively for the eagle." So, through this first half of our period, we must think of Goethe as presiding with Olympian majesty over German literature, advising, correcting, teaching both by precept and example. His fame was world-wide, to his countrymen his voice must have been that of an oracle. Still, it is as critic first and foremost that we picture him in these years of lordly old age The process of years had tamed the glow of his imagination, though it left his judgment clear and his lifelong supremacy indisputable as ever.

Romantic leaders

The earlier Romantics, who carried on Lessing's liberationist work, died before Goethe himself. Burger and Musæus did not see out the Eighteenth Century Haller and Bodmer, students of Shakespeare and revivers of old German literature, passed away too Herder, their friend and Goethe's, a Wordsworthian before Wordsworth, survived till 1803, as did the venerable Klopstock Only Wieland (died 1813) can be said to have touched our time These names, therefore—along with that of Iffland (died 1814)—must be left out of account here. But a younger race took up the tale, and (in opposition to the school of Winckelmann and the Classicist leanings of Goethe) insisted on the popular and Romantic features of poetry. Their leaders were Tieck and the Schlegels, Hoffmann, and Uhland. These are the names with which our survey properly begins Neglecting minor divisions, we may proceed to consider

them and their principal followers in chronological succession.

August Schlegel

The brothers Schlegel claim first mention. Their own poems and romances have little importance, but their critical writings did much to strengthen the Romantic tendency *Das Athenæum*, a journal edited by them in the closing years of the Century, paved the way for much that followed. August Wilhelm von Schlegel (1767-1845) was through most of his life a Professor in various German Universities, with intervals during which he lived at Coppet with Madame de Stael, at Vienna, and at Stockholm Along with Tieck, he translated Shakespeare (1799-1810), popularising the study of an author whose works were to be a symbol of revolt in Germany as in France. He travelled in Italy, studied Sanscrit in Paris, helped Goethe and Schiller with their *Horen* (1795), afterwards criticised them with some acerbity. He wrote odes, sonnets, elegies, epigrams, a classical tragedy called *Ion* (1802), verse in fact of all forms, but of no outstanding merit. As critic only is he important to us; his other work, though various and scholarly, need not detain us.

Friedrich Schlegel

Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829), younger and shorter-lived, was even abler than his brother. Literature claimed most of his life, but its closing years were also occupied with public service under Austria. His original work comprised lyrical poems tragedies (*Alarkos*, 1802), romances (*Lucinde*, 1799), this last based on his own marital

experiences, which, like those of his brother, were peculiar. But he, too, survives only as critic His latest books, *Philosophy of Life* (1827) and *Philosophy of History* (1828), with other miscellaneous lectures, are well known in Bohn's translation. The much earlier *Charakteristiken und Kritiken* (1801), reprinted from *Das Athenæum*, contains suggestive criticism of German literature by both brothers Some sketch of their attitude toward that and contemporary questions generally will introduce what has to be said about German Romanticism.

Their teaching

The movement led by these brothers differed in some points from that afterwards started, not without obligations to them, in France. Both began as revolts against Classicism, but the German was actuated also by idealist dislike of the present Both looked back to the Middle Ages, and glorified old national legends. Both sought a deeper faith, and sought it mainly in Nature-worship, with a strong leaning to Roman Catholicism. But while the later French school stood in the wilderness, and bewailed their "afflicting want of a creed," the German writers were quite prepared to construct one A new philosophy, a new religion, especially a new mythology (it is Friedrich Schlegel's word), had to be created. They did not find the task so simple as it appeared. Mythologies are not made — they must grow. But this explains the large place taken by philosophy in the German movement Fichte and Schelling are as much a part of it as any poet. Nay, the poets themselves were students of dialectic Schiller was a

Kantian, and seduced Goethe into much discussion of dubious profit. After 1781,[1] says a hostile critic, even Goethe and Schiller allowed philosophy to run away with poetry. The tendency is so natural to a German mind that we need not ascribe it entirely to the influence of these two masters But it is very marked, and to a large extent brought about the revolt against Goethe His clear-cut mind, after Schiller's death, leant less to vague speculation, rested more in a serene Paganism. Against this the Romantics set up mystical Pantheism. Religion, which had been so airily laid aside, so easily supposed to be reconstructible, avenged herself on her adversaries. Sentimental patronage of the Roman Church ended in blind acceptance of her claims While the initial aim had been critical and revolutionary, the ultimate effect of the movement was retrograde and reactionary

Religious prepossession

The personal history of the brothers Schlegel illustrates this change. Art, philosophy, and literature came to be looked on by them from a purely religious standpoint The younger brother joined the Church of Rome, as did Tieck, "Novalis," &c The elder, without actually submitting, tended that way. They visited Italy, not like Goethe to absorb Classical influence, but to revive the study of mediæval art. Giotto and Fra Angelico were rescued by them from the neglect of ages. Their teaching started a school of painters, such as Cornelius (1783 - 1867), who painted in a

[1] The year of Lessing's death, and of the publication of Kant's *Critique of pure reason*

cloister to avoid debasing verisimilitude, Overbeck (1789-1869), the great frescoist, and others. Thus they in many ways anticipated both our Tractarian and Pre-Raphaelite movements. But one-sided criticism, coupled in the case at least of the elder brother with overweening self-conceit, finally led them into strange places. Not content with a religious art, they must have an art dependent on and ministering solely to religious teaching. Calderón was therefore a greater poet than Shakespeare, Zacharias Werner (1768-1823), an extravagant writer of third-rate tragedies, had to be exalted against Goethe and Schiller. From Romantic pantheism to Ultramontane dogmatism—from Spinoza and Shakespeare to Aquinas and Calderón—they ran the gamut within a brief compass of years The stream thus lost in a bog does not reappear in its original form. It doubtless permeates all later thought, fertilises song and philosophy after undergoing further transmutation. But the Romanticism thus led astray would hardly have survived to a second generation, even had no other hostile influence come in to give it the *coup de grâce*

Popular approval

One more point may be noted. In France, Romanticism had to fight the whole force of Academic and official conservatism. Even with us it had to face the wrath of the Anti-jacobin writers, the contempt of critics like Jeffrey, though not an organised opposition as in Paris. But in Germany it had the people at its back No literary clique, no cultured taste, opposed either the earlier

movement of Goethe and Schiller, or the later development we are now considering. Perhaps the school suffered from the absence of wholesome criticism. The Schlegels, says Heine, had only to stand on the field of victory, and sing pæans over the slain. Goethe himself, in his later criticism, speaks leniently of the excesses in which these new ultra-Romantic writers indulged. Germany was the home of romanticism, of sentimentalism, of the new disease called *Wertherism*, in fact. The wildest freaks of her writers were more than equalled by contemporary historical facts. Neither literature nor society rested on an assured basis Any pranks might conceivably be played with either; and both licences were taken to the full Whatever we think of Goethe's own life, it stands out dignified and self-restrained beside that of many of his contemporaries. The wonder is, not that wild experiments were tried, but that so much method was observed in their madness. And now we may go on to see what manner of recruits ranged themselves below the banner upheld by the Schlegels

Tieck

Johann Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853) may be classed as an industrious man of letters Lyrics, dramas, romances, satires flowed freely from his pen. Perhaps his most influential work was translating Shakespeare along with the elder Schlegel, and Don Quixote (1799-1801) on his own account. But his original writing, if derivative rather than independent, made him a leader in his

day, and a vein of sarcastic humour procured him the absurd title of "a Romantic Aristophanes" Early novels (*Abdallah* and *William Lovell*, 1795) and plays (*Genevière de Brabant*, 1800, *Kaiser Octavianus*, 1804) betray the influence of his Jena friends; and his lyric poetry follows Romantic model. *Phantasus* (1812-17), the chief success of his middle life, is a collection of mediæval tales After 1820 the predominant influence is that of Goethe (shown much earlier in *Sternbald's Wanderungen*, 1798, which clearly recalls *Wilhelm Meister*) To this last period belong his chief novels, *Das Dichterleben* (1828), a study of the youthful Shakespeare, and *Der Tod des Dichters* (1829), a reminiscence of Camoens Through all stages, therefore, Tieck was assimilator more than originator, and his writings have little permanent value of their own. But both as critic and creator he was a large figure in his day.

Hoffmann

Ernst Theodor Wilhelm Hoffmann (1776-1822), usually called "Amadeus Hoffmann," was one of the wildest spirits of the school. Satirist and caricaturist, he loved the grisly side of Romanticism, dealing in corpses and spectres instead of nymphs and fairies. His imagination brooked no discipline, his satiric criticism no rein of reason or good taste The "Philistine" got no quarter at his hands. Yet he is Romantic to the core, with whatever extravagance; a leader, fighting himself in the front rank. Napoleon's conquest of Germany deprived him of a small official post, and for some years he suffered much privation. But his pen never

ceased, as the tales included in *Phantasie-Stucke* (1814), *Nacht-Stucke* (1817), and *Die Serapionsbruder* (1819-25) sufficiently show. Many of these have been translated into English; Carlyle's studies of both Tieck and Hoffmann are familiar. *The Devil's Elixir* (1816), *Klein Zaches* (1819), *Der Doppeltganger* (1822), with the shorter *Fraulein von Scudery* and *Meister Martin der Kufer* (1825), may be singled out as representative of his tales; while *Lebensansichten des Katers Murr* (1821-22) gives a good notion of his wit and humour, with some amount of autobiographic detail.

Much more important to literature was the work of Friedrich Heinrich Karl, Baron de la Motte Fouqué (1777-1843). As poet we rank him, in virtue not only of his epics and plays, such as *Sigurd* (1808), *Corona* (1814), and *Bertrand du Guesclin* (1821), but of his well-known romances, which are surely prose poems, besides breathing the purest essence of Romanticism If *Undine* (1811) be perfect as a legend of awakening girlhood, *Sintram and his Companions* (1814) not less finely gives the storm and stress of boyhood, touched to noble issues, and girt by unseen powers and possibilities. *Aslauga's Knight*, *The two Captains*, *Thiodulf*, and the *Ring of Magic*, complete the enchanting series as known to English readers, though this is far indeed from representing his entire output. A soldier in his youth, a country gentleman in later days, Fouqué never knew the trials and troubles of literary life. But he reached without effort high levels of literary achievement, and

Fouqué

shines though an amateur with a clearer light than his professional compeers. Captious critics may style his art "bastard-Romantic"; the general verdict seems nearer the truth in accepting it as carrying its own patent of nobility His collected *Gedichte* appeared in five volumes in 1816-27, his works (edited by himself) in twelve volumes (1841-46).

All these writers were more or less friends and fellow-workers, and there remain some lesser and younger names to be added Heinrich von Kleist (1777-1811) survives mostly by his plays, such as *Die Hermanns-Schlacht* (1809), directed against Napoleon and the French; but his short life ended by his own hand almost before our period had begun. Clemens Brentano (1778-1842) and his brother-in-law Ludwig Achim von Arnim (1781-1859) published together a book of poems *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1806-8), popular then and charming still. Brentano was a strange solitary mortal, who began with *Satiren* (1800), went on to plays (*Ponce de Léon*, 1804, *Die Gründung Prags* 1815), and bizarre poems (*An eine Kranke*, *Die Geschichte vom braven Kasperl*, &c), and latterly betrayed clear signs of madness Von Arnim wrote plays and novels (*The Heath-cock*, *Isabella von Egypt* *Die Kronenwachter*, &c) His wife, Brentano's sister, was the "Bettina" of a famous correspondence with Goethe; another sister became Madame de Savigny. Adelbert von Chamisso (1781-1838) lived a roving life as a naturalist, and later combined poetry with the duties of keeper of the Botanical Garden at

Younger writers

Berlin He is best known by his story of *Peter Schlemihl* (1813), the man who sold his shadow to the Devil. But his poems also deserve attention, blending early romanticism with a touch of modernity which gradually leads him away from the old methods He shows skill in metre, passing from ballad-verse to *terza rima*, and from that again to alliterative measures on the Norse model, with equal facility. The overmastering influence of Goethe and Schiller, it may be noted, drove younger singers of this Central School to assert originality by abnormal methods—by eccentricities of subject and style, or by sedulous devotion to form, that form which the aged Goethe declared he would violate in all directions were he beginning again, to show that inspiration is not conditioned by any particular mould or method.

With our next poets the scene changes. Kerner and Uhland belong to the "Swabian school" But this is a merely local distinction Both are emphatically Romantic, and in no sense form a separate development Kerner expressly denied that there was any such school each of us, he said, sings through his own beak, just as his heart bids him Andreas Justinus Kerner (1786-1862) was a physician at Wildbad, and a student of occult science, animal magnetism, and the like. He had a fine gift of song, shown in such favourite lyrics as "Wohlauf noch getrunken," &c., to be found in his *Gedichte* (1826: enlarged edition, 1854) This remained his through life, from *Romantische Dichtungen* (1817) to *Winterblüten* (1859). But his ghostly studies also

Kerner

engaged much of his thought, and are embodied in *Die Seherin von Prevorst* (1829), a tale which has gone through many editions

Johann Ludwig Uhland (1787-1862), but a few months younger than Kerner, was the acknowledged head of the Swabian singers, and may be considered chief poet of the later Romantic school. His best lyrics and ballads—such as *Es zogen drei Burschen, Ich hatt' einen Kameraden, Das Gluck von Edenhall*—are familiar to English readers, some of them through Longfellow's translations Even Heine finds nothing bitter to say against Uhland, though characteristically insinuating that his best pupils surpassed their master in various points. Born and dying in Tubingen, he lived all his life in Germany, except for one visit of less than a year to Paris about 1810, and his life and verse were both thoroughly patriotic, to Germany first, to Swabia second. His cycle of ballads, *Graf Eberhardt der Rauschebart*, with many other pieces, illustrates the latter, his whole poetry the former. His gentle, kindly nature endeared him to all Educated as a lawyer, he was elected deputy for Tubingen in 1819, and continued in public service for the remainder of life. But his heart was always with poetry His *Gedichte* first appeared in collected form in 1815, and were continually added to thereafter. The "jubilee edition" of 1886 is the fullest. A three-volume edition of his "Works" bears date 1892. Two plays, *Ernst von Schwaben* (1818) and *Ludwig der Bayer* (1819), show patriotic feeling and beauty of detail, but hardly

Uhland.

dramatic power On the other hand, some critical essays are masterly, such as *Walther von Vogelweid* (1822) and *Alte Volkslieder* (1844) But Uhland's glory rests on his lyrical verse, and this is of singular beauty, with a tender sweetness all his own.

Zenith of romanticism

In Uhland's poems the Romantic revival seems to reach its zenith. Uhland in verse, Fouqué in prose, record its high-water mark. Critics have suggested that Uhland is not properly a Romantic; he does not share the *Traumerei* and *Schwarmerei*—shall we say the dreaminess and sentimentalism ?—of the school But the extravagances of a movement are not its hall-marks Uhland is dreamy and sentimental, within bounds of reason, if he did not push these to absurdity, so much the better for his judgment. He avoids the grotesqueness of Hoffmann, the bizarrerie of Brentano. But to call Uhland non-romantic is like saying that Shakespeare is undramatic, or Homer unheroic. Rather he seems to sum up and contain all that is best in the German Romantic ideal. Its tenderness, its naiveté, its humanity, its love of Nature, of antiquity, of the legendary and mystical—its metrical freedom and Wordsworthian directness of handling—all are worthily exemplified in his poems Space forbids illustrating this by quotation. Fortunately his verse is too well known to render such a course necessary. Whatever critics of his own race say, to outsiders Uhland seems to represent the very crown of the German Romantic movement. He was, it has been justly said, not the father of a school, but the child of one. Con-

temporary or immediately succeeding writers may appear to echo Uhland, but it is because they shared the inspiration which he absorbed and gathered to a focus. In his verse, as in his liberty-loving life, he summed up all the aspiration and idealistic striving of the best minds of his generation, and clothed them with form to which his beloved Swabia furnished a fitting background.

Regarded in this way, we may take Uhland as the active leader of German poetry during the earlier part of our period. There is no need to recognise subdivisions One department of verse alone must be excepted, and that only partially. The German Romantic movement was greatly helped by the long war with Napoleon. Resistance to France became the watchword in poetry as well as in politics, and the despotism of Racine as hateful as that of Buonaparte. During the years 1805-15 patriot fervour produced passionate song The Romantic poets were not behind; Uhland, Fouqué, Brentano, and others smote the Tyrtæan lyre. But this special strain required singers of its own Foremost of such was Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769-1860), who throughout his long life never ceased to defy tyranny—that of Napoleon in earlier days, that of a reactionary Government later. Teacher and writer of history, he also made history by his spirit-stirring songs, of which *Was ist des deutschen Vaterland?* is alone sufficient example He was ably seconded by Maximilian von Schenkendorf (1783-1817), who hymned the victory of Leipzic, and Friedrich Ruckert (1788-1860), author of *Deutsche*

Patriotic poetry

Gedichte (1817), afterwards a distinguished philologer and translator of Oriental books into German verse. But the young Marcellus of the war was Karl Theodor Korner (1791-1813), who had begun as dramatist, but joining Lutzow's Cavalry in 1813 electrified his comrades with fiery lyrics, afterwards published under the title of *Lyre and Sword*, and fell in fight before the close of that fateful year. "Lutzow's wild hunt," the *Bundeslied vor der Schlacht*, and the *Sword-song* (written in a pause of his last battle), are among the best-known of these; but perhaps the "Prayer during fight," with its solemn *Vater, ich rufe dich!* will last as long as anything he wrote

The patriotic poets—of whom these are only the leading names—shared the Romantic impulse, as did the Romantic poets the patriotic impulse, and even here no strict line of demarcation is necessary. But at any rate these two divisions comprise all that is noteworthy in German poetry at this time. Lyrics, ballads, romances, and dramas are the favourite form of verse, with occasional adoption of mediæval or earlier measures, sonnets and terza rima from Italy, alliterative verse from Scandinavia It will be noticed that the drama is not classed separately As in France, as in England, drama had little independent life of its own. Goethe and Schiller might fill it with breath of their genius, but they created no dramatic impulse, transmitted no new modification of its idea. Tragedy and comedy continued to be written, just as did narrative poems, pastorals, and sonnets. But these were forms of verse

Drama

merely, one might say forms of poetical exercise, not involving any independent and original impulse; the real force, the creative inspiration of the day, expressed itself mainly in lyric measures of all kind.

Resuming the main current of Romantic poetry, we need stay to mention at present but one more Swabian writer, Gustav Schwab (1792-1850), who followed the lead of Uhland without sharing his genius, but had a rather happy turn for ballad

Austrian poets

Austria about this time contributed some notable poets Joseph, Baron Eichendorff (1788-1857), a volunteer in the campaign of 1813-15, produced plays (*Ezzelin von Romano*, 1828), several novels in which the best things are their occasional verses, and poems of true song-gift and love of nature, witness the favourite "In einem kuhlen Grunde," to be found in his collected *Gedichte* (1837), a favourite volume still with youths and maidens Joseph Christian, Baron Zedlitz (1790-1862), a fellow-soldier with Eichendorff, and afterwards holder of several state offices, wrote dramas (*Kerker und Krone*, 1834) and narrative poems (*Waldfraulein*, 1843), but excelled especially in certain reflective pieces (*Todtenkranzen*, 1827) commemorating not unworthily the death of such men as Goethe, Canning, Byron, Tasso, and Napoleon His *Gedichte* are collected in a volume dated 1832. A more remarkable genius was that of Franz Grillparzer (1791-1872). First and foremost a dramatist, he almost suggests reconsideration of our dictum about the absence of independent dramatic life at this time And indeed his plays, with those of Werner (*ante*, p.

289) and Adolf Mullner (1774-1829), are sometimes classed apart as constituting a school of "destiny-drama" We may perhaps see in Grillparzer's plays, such as *Sappho* (1819) and *The Golden Fleece* (1822), &c, a nearer approach to Romantic Tragedy written of set purpose, with a partial anticipation too of Ibsenite methods, than we find in any other contemporary. But his field is not wide, and his influence was not great Like Browning, he was the occasion of a Society being formed to study his works; but in this case the poet's death preceded the formation of the guild His other writings comprise lyrical poems (jubilee edition, 1891), one novel (*Der Spielmann*, 1848), and an historical study (*Ottokar's Gluck und Ende*, 1825).

The central school of German poetry, meantime, continued to flourish. We may take the chief names in chronological order, without much care for dates of individual works. Ernst Schulze (1789-1817), a true if not powerful Romantic, was author of narrative poems (*Cacelie*, *Die bezauberte Rose*, &c) in ottava rima on legendary and mythological subjects. Wilhelm Muller (1794-1827), again, poet and philologer, father of our eminent Oxford professor, wrote folk-songs which are no mere slavish reproduction of antique models, but breathe the genuine spirit of popular pastoral song. An edition of his poems by his son appeared in 1869 August, Count von Platen (1796-1835), began as a Romantic with his play of *The glass slippers*, but diverged later to Classical odes, idylls (such as *The fisher of Capri*), Italian sonnets and *ritornelli*, and Persian *ghazels*.

Central group

Learning with him was stronger than inspiration, and he is frequently bracketed with Rückert (*ante*, p. 297). His attack on Heine as the "Romantic Œdipus" drew on him that writer's fiercest attack. Karl Leberecht Immermann (1796-1840), lifelong friend of Heine, shone more in prose than poetry, but led off with numerous plays (*The Princes of Syracuse*, *Roncevál*, *Periander*, &c.), *Gedichte* (1825), and an epic poem, *Tristan und Isolde*. Two satirical novels, *Die Epigonen* and *Münchhausen*, published late in life, contain perhaps his best work. Christian Friedrich Scherenberg (1798-1881) followed a line of his own in patriotic poems on *Waterloo*, *Ligny*, *Aboukir*, &c., and was equally spontaneous and natural in his lyric verse. August Heinrich Hoffmann (1798-1874) usually called "Hoffmann of Fallersleben," a librarian and philologist, and writer of political poems (*Unpolitischen Lieder*, 1840) of a revolutionary character, was also a maker of folk-songs which take no mean place in the splendid roll of German popular lyrics, though his more ambitious verse is less successful. The best edition of his poems is in nine volumes (1887). Albert Knapp (1798-1864) may deserve a special place for his *Christlichen Gedichte* (1829), in which religion for once does not overpower poetry. His collected poems bear date 1843. August Kopisch (1799-1853), poet and painter, should be mentioned not only for some excellent translations (Dante, 1840, &c.), but for his humorous, poetico-comic *Historie von Noah*, and tales of sprites and cobolds. His *Gedichte* appeared in 1836, and his collected works (five volumes) in 1856.

The year we have now reached, keeping always to order of birth-date, produced an author destined to work something like a revolution in German poetry Heinrich Heine loved to call himself the "first man of his Century," but his actual birthday was in December 1799 Before going on to consider a career by far the most poetically important of any which properly come within our survey in this chapter, it seems needful to pause and take stock of the extent to which the Romantic Triumph had affected literature in other fields. Rightly to understand Heine's work, we must have some idea of the world into which he was born, as it manifested itself in written thought, whether under shape of prose or verse Poetry and the drama have been sketched down to the date at which he enters the arena; the no less large and fruitful influences which worked otherwise than in verse must be reckoned with. To attempt any exhaustive treatment of these latter would be presumptuous and useless such slight record as will bring out the salient facts under each head is probably all that the literary student will ask or expect

Prose writing

The novel had been written in Germany by many eminent hands Most of the poets had tried it Goethe, "Novalis," Fouqué, Tieck, Arnim, Brentano, Hoffmann, and others, have been mentioned as writing romances. One writer of the first rank confined himself to this province. But Jean Paul Friedrich Richter (1763-1825) belongs to the period before ours. He was indeed still writing,

Richter

had still to give us *Fibel's Life* (1812) and *Nicolas Markgraf* (1820), besides various patriotic writings during the war, and an unfinished *Autobiography* (1826). His influence was so potent, and on Heine in particular exercised so lasting an effect, that a single remark on the upshot of his work may not be out of place here

A German reviewer credits Richter with "perfecting the comic romance" This seems true only with large exception. There is nothing in the least resembling the humorous story of Dickens Perhaps the emphasis lies on the word *romance;* but in that case "comic romance" seems rather a contradiction in terms. If we widen the phrase into "philosophico-comic romance," the difficulty is at least partly avoided. With Richter and Goethe, the German novel was fairly launched on its career. But it was not quite what we understand by the term *novel.* No Scott, no Thackeray, no Dickens came to bend it into plastic shape It remained rather a philosophic miscellany, a self-conscious dealing with ideas under story form, its method a compound of Swift and Sterne, the *Spectator* and Fielding, or rather Smollett. Only much later did dramatic verisimilitude take due place in the German novel. To the men of Heine's time, it was still what it had been to us in the days before Scott—an ingenious medley, capable of much variety and of expressing much of the subtlest thought and wildest fun of a bold or unconventional author, but rarely having for its chief feature a strong set of incidents vividly told.

The German novel

Such the German novel remained through at least the main part of our period. And, with the exception of the poets and others who wrote "romances" as part of their imaginative work, there are hardly any other names of novelists worthy of record. Ernest Wagner (1768-1812) was an imitator of Richter, who however barely comes within our limits. Johann Heinrich Daniel Zschokke (1771-1848), a German Swiss, schoolmaster and politician, wrote many volumes of tales, but hardly showed much original faculty. Georg Wilhelm Heinrich Haring (1797-1884), under the name of "Willibald Alexis," wrote a novel (*Walladmor*, 1823) which was credited to Scott and translated by De Quincey, with many other unimportant volumes of fiction, travel, &c. On the whole, it may be safely said that the novel is one of the least interesting and least important fields of German literature at this time, except only as poetised by the Romantics or as filled with flowers of strange bloom by Richter. Goethe himself, in his rôle of novelist, by no means fulfils the expectations raised by his poems, and even *Wilhelm Meister* need not be withdrawn from the scope of this characterisation.

Some minor novelists

In critical literature the Germans have long excelled. The poets are once again our chief authorities for imaginative criticism. Besides those lately named, Johann Heinrich Voss (1751-1826), author of *Luise* and translator of Homer, &c., though his poetical work was now over, published late in life an important critical work, *Anti-Symbolik*

Critics

(1824-26), in answer to Creuzer's treatise about to be named. Among writers not poets, Wilhelm von Humboldt, to be noted later in connection with science, deserves mention here for his translations from the Classics, and his critical studies of Goethe, Schiller, &c. (1799), as well as for later philological work of a very original kind, covering nearly all known languages. Friedrich Creuzer (1771-1858), professor of philology at Heidelberg, put forth in 1810-12 a ponderous but ill-advised work on the symbolical interpretation of Ancient mythology (*Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Volker*), replied to with crushing effect by Voss. The brothers Grimm, besides publishing their famous *Marchen* (1812-22), were conspicuous workers in the field of philological criticism. Jakob Ludwig Karl Grimm (1785-1863), promulgator of "Grimm's Law," established his fame by *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819), and spent his life on similar work, also starting the great and still unfinished *Deutsches Worterbuch* His brother, Wilhelm Karl Grimm (1786-1859), was a scarcely less eminent writer on the same lines, in collaboration and alone Henri Steffens (1773-1845), Norwegian by birth, studied at Jena under Schelling and Freiberg under Werner, settled in Germany, and became a prominent member of the Romantic group, and a prolific writer on critical and scientific subjects. Karl August Varnhagen von Ense (1785-1858), with his charming wife, both wrote biography and criticism, and kept for years a salon where the greatest writers of the day met and talked, and where Heine made his début in literary society.

To these may be added the names of Heine's friend Moses Moser (died 1838), who, though he published nothing, seems to have been in conversation a brilliant and suggestive critic, and of Heine's opponent Wolfgang Menzel (1798-1873), who filled a long life with copious historical and critical writings, attacking from a conservative point of view the innovators in poetry and politics, including Goethe, whom he dubbed the "great Pagan." His *Streckverse* (1823), *Deutsche Litteratur* (1827, enlarged later), plays named *Rubezahl* (1829) and *Narcissus* (1830), and novel *Furore* (1851), probably did less to inculcate these views than his twenty-two years (1826-48) as literary editor of the well-known *Morgenblatt*.

Journalism played no very conspicuous part in these troubled times, when the press was still far from free.

Journalists.

But among writers of literary power, who yet gave fully more attention to politics than to literature, Gories and Borne deserve note. Jakob Joseph von Gories (1776-1848) was a keen student of old German poetry, an equally keen Liberal in politics, who was finally exiled by an absolutist Government, and ended as a theological mystic Ludwig Borne (1786-1837), of Jewish extraction, an indefatigable journalist, settled in Paris after the Revolution of 1830, was intimate with Lamennais, wrote there his most important book, *Briefe aus Paris* (1832), quarrelled with Heine, and was somewhat scurvily treated by the latter in a memorial paper, of which more anon. Adam Heinrich Muller (1779-1829), too, co-editor with Kleist (*ante*, p. 293) of a

magazine called *Phoebus* in 1808, wrote many books supporting the Catholic reaction, and curiously mixing up mysticism and political economy, whose names are not worth recalling now. And a more hard-headed thinker, August von Haxthausen (Baron of Haxthausen-Abbenberg, 1792-1866), developed the literary side of politics and of constitutional history in such works as *Die Agrarverfassung* (1829), first of a series of masterly treatises on the land-laws, especially of Russia and Germany.

In the special field of Classical criticism, Germany assumed at this time a leadership which she has never since lost. The pioneer-work of Heyne and Wolf, followed in splendid succession by Hermann, Lobeck, Buckh, Bekker, Brandis, Bopp, Lachmann, and Ottfried Muller — with the brothers Grimm as mentioned before, and Gesenius doing kindred work in Hebrew — had results far beyond the bounds of their special studies. It is too narrow a view which ignores the importance to literature of a training-school such as the labours of these men afforded, and as a matter of fact their position as teachers enabled them to wield an influence which is continually reflected in the writings of their pupils. And this influence, too, must be regarded as tending on the whole toward freedom and independence and fearlessness of judgment, as well as to the most minute and relentless accuracy.

Scholars

If this last field was not one in which Romantic

ideas could have full play, it is otherwise when we come to the department of History. There, hardly less than in poetry, the new teaching worked powerfully. Arnold Hermann Ludwig Heeren (1760-1842) had shown the way to a more vivid and "modern" handling of ancient history, in Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831) we find the lesson fully learned. A Dane by birth, Niebuhr had studied in both London and Edinburgh, but finally settled in Prussia. Precisely at the beginning of our period (1810-12) he gave, in the then new University of Berlin, those lectures on Roman history which first made him famous From 1816 to 1823 he resided at Rome as Prussian ambassador, then for seven more years lectured with great acceptance at Bonn. The Revolution of 1830 was a terrible shock to him, and is said to have caused or hastened his death. His chief works have been translated into English (the earlier volumes of his *Roman History* by Hare and Thirlwall), and are too well known to need enumeration

History Niebuhr

Like Wolf in Homeric criticism, Niebuhr in ancient history used canons and criteria which were applicable to many other subjects. The stir which his views made in England has been already referred to. It was not merely that events formerly accepted as facts were shown to be legendary. Whether Romulus and Horatius Cocles were real persons or mythical was a matter of sufficiently remote interest to most readers. But it was tolerably clear that the same process could be applied over a much wider field, and to events and persons of much

Niebuhr's method

greater importance. So far as Niebuhr's actual contentions are concerned, there can be little doubt that he used his obliterating sponge too freely. Legends generally imply a foundation of some sort; myths grow up only around an actual person The existence of Romulus and Remus is not disproved by arguing that the story of their being suckled by a wolf is fictitious. But the spirit which tests ancient tales by strict canons of historical evidence gains strength with every increase of our knowledge It becomes the fundamental postulate, the demand not to be gainsaid, of modern science in all departments. And Niebuhr's work was a most important factor in developing this spirit.

How widely his teaching has spread needs hardly to be dwelt on. We shall see it presently influencing other branches of thought. From the Romantic impulse toward revolutionary criticism it derived its strength The Romantic Movement indeed studied the Past, and looked back with wistful yearning to the great days gone by. But it insisted on closer vision, clearer knowledge. It was not content to worship the Past from a respectful distance. It sought to get face to face with it, to see it living and moving before our eyes Anything that withstood this approach it was ready to tear down and destroy. No veils, no formalities, no assumptions and hypotheses, were allowed to come in the way. The notion of ancient history as a sacred region, where demigods and heroes walked, whom it were profane to touch and impious to judge by our standards and tests,

And results

was wholly alien to the new criticism. If, in the process of making closer acquaintance, some awkward difficulties were disclosed; if much that had been reckoned certain was proved dubious,—that was not the inquirer's fault. His search was simply for fact, and he would follow the search whithersoever it led. A tendency to iconoclasm, a delight in smashing for the sake of the blow, instead of for the sake of the clearing thereby effected, not unnaturally accompanied this zeal for truth. Reformers are generally men with a bias. The hard work of pioneering is done by men whose thews and sinews rejoice to be exercised. We who come after, and who delight in the wider prospect opened out by their toil, should be ungrateful if we disparaged the sturdy boldness which was ready to encounter any obstacle

Successors to Niebuhr

After Niebuhr came Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann (1785-1860), professor at Gottingen, Jena, and Bonn, who did good work at the *Quellenkunde* of German History (1830), and by a History of Denmark (1840-43) He was a staunch Liberal, and played a prominent part in 1848, though far from an incendiary. Johann August Wilhelm Neander (1789-1850), more conservative in sympathies, shared the contemporary impulse to fresh and vivid treatment of history. A converted Jew, he devoted himself to ecclesiastical study, his great *History of Christianity* coming out from 1825 to 1852. Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) may be called the inaugurator of our modern school of history, and through his long life produced a series of important works, especially deal-

ing with the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, which he made his "period" Berlin secured him as professor of history in 1825, and retained him for the rest of his life His *Popes* came out in 1834-37, and were translated into English by Sarah Austin, wife of the great jurisconsult, since when they have been a textbook in all our schools Among his other works, which in collected form number fifty-four volumes, may be specially named *German Reformation History* (6 vols., 1839-62), *French* (6 vols., 1852-61), and *English* (9 vols, 1859-67). His later writings include several biographical studies, and a *World-History* (1881-88) Johann Martin Lappenberg (1794-1865), City Librarian at Hamburg, besides much work on local antiquities, wrote a painstaking *History of England* (1834-37, English translation, 1845 seq), subsequently continued by a younger student of the subject, Reinhold Pauli (1823-82)

Jurisconsults

Cognate to history was the important work of Paul Johann Anselm von Feuerbach (1775-1833), father of a notorious writer on theology. The elder Feuerbach was a jurist of high rank, who applied the new ideas to his chosen science, and partly anticipated the labours of our Austin. His writings are too technical to require citation here, but they illustrate the versatility of the new departure, the widespread ramification of its informing influence This is still more strikingly exemplified in Friedrich Karl von Savigny (1779-1861), German by birth and education, Professor at Berlin from 1810 to 1842,

whose early writings on the *Law of Possession* (1803), and later works on *Roman Law* (1815-31 and 1840-49), gave him European reputation Savigny was a leader of the "historical school" of jurists, and was aided in his researches by his wife, a sister of the poet Brentano, and by his pupil Jakob Grimm His principal opponent was Anton Friedrich Justus Thibaut (1772-1840), professor of Civil Law at Jena and Heidelberg.

But the new departure was still more remarkable in philosophy, philosophical science, and theology

Philosophy Schelling

No one will expect here a criticism of German metaphysic But we may at least remember how to the dominant sensationist philosophy of his time, carried to logical issue by the scepticism of Hume, Kant sought to oppose the impregnable barrier of an idealistic conception of the universe, which should substitute everlasting relations of thought for evanescent impressions of sense, and how Fichte developed this into universal pantheism, his *ego* being a synthesis of self with the eternal that surrounds it. To these succeeded Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1765-1854), whose long life extended through our whole period. In actual achievement Schelling added little to Fichte. He was less originator than expositor; poet more than philosopher, indeed, and as such all the more interesting to us. He did not seek to found a school, sworn to a particular set of ideas; but rather to instil a spirit, which might work in each disciple to different results.

And that spirit was a species of poetical intuition. His greatest works, the *Philosophy of Nature* (1797), *Transcendental Philosophy* (1800), and *Philosophy of Identity* (1803), had been before the public for some time They sought to explain the Fichtean *ego* in terms of general thought rather than of mere reasoning, identifying it with that process by which the world-soul becomes conscious of itself. Schelling, airily says Heine, is simply Spinosa No doubt in a sense all modern philosophy is developed Spinosa. But Schelling is Spinosa diluted into mysticism, and refined to ultra-tenuity by imaginative rhetoric. In later days Schelling, as Fichte to some extent, considerably modified his teaching. He took up with Catholic presuppositions, and was roundly accused of betraying philosophy into the hands of clericalism. Those who cannot credit this must yet admit that his bolt was already shot, and that his later work has little of the earlier's rich sentiment and plastic force.

Schelling has been called the philosopher par excellence of the Romantic School. If this refers merely to his personal intimacy with many of its leaders, the fact is unquestionable But the phrase evidently points further, and indicates a relation of thought as well as of personal sympathy Nor is the criticism unjust. There is much in his attitude, even that of the youthful Schelling, which suggests the fancifulness and warm-heartedness of the true Romantic. We are far from the calm analysis, the passionless meditation, marking the ideal philo-

His attitude

sopher. Thought glows and burns, metaphysic assumes the garb and bearing of poetry. In "nature" Schelling sees not merely stuff for thought, but the radiance of a divine manifestation. The poet studies it with rapture, while the thinker apprehends its deeper message and meaning. Schelling's scheme of thought had much influence in England, where it was popularised mainly by Coleridge, to some extent also by De Quincey and Carlyle In Germany its fate was different Even before the volte-face of its author alienated sympathy and excited criticism, it had suffered premature extinction through the rise of a greater luminary. Between Fichte before him and Hegel after, Schelling's philosophy could hardly be more than a temporary resting-place, a pause and breathing-ground of thought. But during its brief day it was influential, and realised something like what we read about the impulse and authority exerted by Greek sages of olden time.

Hegel

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was but five years younger than Schelling, and speedily outstripped him in popularity. Both men were teachers almost pure and simple, their lives call for no record apart from their work. Together, in Jena, they edited the *Critical Journal of Philosophy* (1802); after that their paths and ideas diverged The University of Jena was closed by Napoleon in 1807; Hegel went to Nuremberg, returning later to Heidelberg and Berlin, while Schelling was stationed at Munich and Erlangen, and came to Berlin only when Hegel was already ten years dead.

At the opening of our period, Hegel had published one important book, *Phaenomenology of Spirit* (1807). The first volume of his *Logik* appeared in 1812, and for close on twenty years following he was the acknowledged chief of German philosophy, his various lectures being published in successive volumes at short intervals, while his collected works only began to be issued after his death, and it took a dozen years before the tale of eighteen volumes was completed by the reverent care of his disciples.

Personality

Hegel's contribution to German, or rather to universal, philosophy was of course one of enormous and far-reaching importance. We have however here to consider, not the world-renowned reasoner, but the master of contemporary thought, the creator of a school, the dictator and irresistible overlord of young Germany's speculation It is that dark and mysterious Hegel who fascinated Heine's youthful mind, who in his supreme calm seemed to him the greatest philosopher since Leibniz, but whose sepulchral tones and sardonic, tortuous sayings terrified while they attracted, as the serpent fascinates a bird It is the Hegel of startlingly vulgar utterances, who declared the stars were but a leprosy of heaven, and when his pupil besought him to say if there were not there a place of reward for the righteous, growled out, "What! you want a *trinkgeld* for having been dutiful to your mother and not having poisoned your brother." No doubt much of this is "only Heine's fun," as when he assures us that Hegel made him believe himself a god, and he did his best to

live up to his privileges. But there is truth underlying the satire The blunt directness of Hegel's style is often in curious contrast with his reputation for unintelligibility. From him come most of those naive metaphors which intersperse our modern metaphysicians' discourses on the absolute. His emphatic prose snuffs out the candle of Schelling's poetical mysticism. The light of common day rests on his pages He is practical even to coarseness, and by no means taught his pupils to dream. The philosopher, with him, must go down into the market-place, and serve his fellow-men with manful exertion And yet, all the time, the completeness of his intellectual system seems to leave no loophole for escape Every activity of thought is accounted for, the place of each is settled, its function prescribed In practical life, this teacher is the shrewdest of business men and politicians; while in intellectual he is the Rhadamanthus of a final appeal-court, brooking no evasion, and irrevocably determining the fate of whatever comes before his ken.

"I never understood Hegel," says Heine somewhere Probably many of his pupils would have confessed the same, given sufficient brains and honesty "Only one man has understood me," he is reported to have himself said—then adding, "and he does not" But, whether they understood him or not, he carried his students off their feet. The intoxication of that complete, all-embracing system was as fire in their veins The secret of the universe was being unfolded as he lectured. Here, beyond doubt, was the

Influence of school

key of all knowledge. Idolising devotion, arrogant contempt of all other systems, were the natural corollaries. Those who have felt the spell of a great teacher will be slow to blame the fervour of such loyalty. Wholehearted belief is a noble thing, though its results may not always be noble. Some results here were grotesque, some painful, many to be deprecated. Hegelianism was a force indeed, and threatened to become a persecuting orthodoxy. All outside the charmed circle were aliens Thoughts hardened into shibboleths, and the identity of being and not-being became a spell to conjure with against gainsayers of every kind. The last word had been spoken; it remained only to apply the master-key to each ward in the complicated lock Young Germany had got a faith, so far as faith implied submission to and reception of the unknown In every branch of thought, in every department of literature, the new doctrine spread For the system of Hegel was nothing if not universal It was regnant in the trivial as much as in the vital Extremes met in the confessor, as in his creed; plain commonsense and metaphysical acumen were but two sides of the same thing, and the method to be used in great matters and small was one and the same There were differences of opinion, of course, as to particular conclusions to be drawn; a right wing and a left wing appeared in the school, a party of conservatism and a party of revolution. But both were agreed as to initial principles, and differed only in the manner of carrying them out.

The progress of philosophy had apparently reached

its term. One eccentric development, a parody rather than a contravention of Hegelianism, will be mentioned later in this chapter. But, with that exception, finality seemed to have been reached Speculation since then has vainly tried to get beyond the Hegelian synthesis, save where it has sought to "hark back to Kant" in the hope of making a fresh departure Farther advance in the original direction is found impossible. At the time, at any rate, this seemed beyond question. No great philosopher came to don Hegel's mantle. Contemporary writers speak of Solger, but, like Emerson of Southey, one is tempted to ask, who is Solger? Of Hegel's own immediate pupils, two only need be named. Eduard Gans (1798-1839), a close friend of Heine's, perhaps the ablest of Hegel's direct followers, paralleled Heine's career as to both change of religion and adoption of French tastes, and was especially prominent in opposing the "historical school" as represented by writers like Savigny Arnold Ruge (1802-80), an enthusiastic liberal and patriot, for some time professor at Halle, represented the extreme left of Hegelianism, and so early as 1821 drew on himself censure and imprisonment From then till 1850 he was a prominent leader of the reforming party, and in the latter year had to fly to England, where he spent the remainder of his days. Neither of these men left philosophical writings of original importance, and as our concern is not with the Hegelian school but only with the effect of Hegelianism on literature, we need not follow further the for-

Right and left wings

tunes of pure philosophy, but turn rather to its chief applications.

Natural science, philosophically studied, had several distinguished votaries. Goethe himself takes high place in virtue of his botanical researches, his theory of colours, and at least one actual discovery in anatomy When Schiller remarked of his view concerning the typical plant-form which undergoes metamorphosis, that it was "not an observation but an idea," the speech struck Goethe as showing a standpoint irreconcilably different from his own; and the remark was certainly strange from a Kantian. Abraham Gottlob Werner (1750-1817), the veteran geologist, survived into the beginning of our epoch. But the most prominent names connected with pure science were those of the brothers Humboldt The elder, Karl Wilhelm (1767-1835), already mentioned as a critic, and a prodigy of all-accomplished intellect, rather interested himself in than worked at natural science A politician of the first rank, for some years Prussian Minister at Rome, and passionately devoted to literary and philological studies, he befriended and encouraged both art and science to his full power, and his successive homes were centres of scientific discussion and thought and energy. His brother, Friedrich Heinrich Alexander, created Baron von Humboldt (1769-1859), who devoted years to distant travel, wrote and lectured while at home, publishing full accounts of his explorations, and after 1830 held high political offices, first abroad and latterly in Berlin. His writings embraced scientific

Science

discussion of the most varied kind, and were finally summed up in the great work of his old age, *Kosmos* (1845-58), an encyclopædic epitome of the studies of his life In a more special field, Lorenz Oken (1779-1851), medical professor at Jena and Munich, imported into physiological teaching ideas drawn from his companionship with Schelling and Hegel, and with the other illustrious men who for a time made Jena a veritable centre of intellectual brilliance Johann Karl Friedrich Gauss (1777-1855), mathematician and astronomer, resident at Gottingen, wrote learnedly on such questions as sidereal motion, terrestrial magnetism, and the transmission of light through lenses, while he is credited with inventing a heliograph and other scientific instruments. Johann Andreas Buchner (1783-1852), physician and chemist, author of many important medical books, edited during most of his life the *Repertorium der Pharmacie* By such men the new thought was applied to science, others carried it to the sphere of religion

Theology Schleiermacher

Theology, in its relation to Romanticism, is almost summed up for us in one name The historical method of Niebuhr, the philosophical method of Schelling, may be said to unite in the teaching of Schleiermacher. It is true that Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827) still lived and wrote, but the younger man carried out what Eichhorn only began. Friedrich Ernst Daniel Schleiermacher (1768-1834) was brought up as an evangelical, among the Moravian brethren; but first at Halle, afterwards at Berlin (where he became ultimately a

theological professor), he widened the borders of his creed and allied himself with the innovating party. In conjunction with Friedrich Schlegel he translated the philosophical works of Plato, and had already before our period opens published many striking theological treatises His chief book, however, *Die Christliche Glaube* (1821-22), had still to come He was a distinguished preacher and church leader, but influenced a yet wider audience by his writings Schelling and Schleiermacher together revolutionised the philosophical theology of Germany, and the movement they started is mighty to this day

With its technical side we have no concern. As a living literary force its influence was powerful. Instead of the dusty syllogisms and arid abstractions of scholastic theology, men were given the idea of a faith broad as humanity, fresh as the morning sunshine, and drawing inspiration less from argument than from experience and intuition. Subjective relations replaced ratiocinative processes, freedom of belief counted for more than orthodoxy. The miraculous element in Christianity was relegated to the background, and feeling rather than knowing made the essence of religion. It is easy to see how this fitted in with the Romantic Revival in secular letters. Schleiermacher has been called the high-priest of Romanticism, and his tolerant criticism of Schlegel's *Lucinde* shows how far sympathy with that view carried him. As a solvent force his work was lasting, and if his constructive work did not equal his destructive, want of will was not the

His teaching

cause. Like many others of his persuasion, however, he was better at throwing down than building up, if it is allowable to judge by results Time has not undone the effect of his critical teaching, but it has transformed his positive conceptions till little of the old is left. And the same result was apparent in the persons of his hearers and readers. They accepted the disintegrating influence, but rarely and for a brief interval followed his lead in matters of affirmation The net result of Schleiermacher's teaching, on the whole, seems but to have been a strengthening of the many revolutionary though well-meaning activities which made for change and confusion in the immediate future, whatever their ultimate effect might be, and whatever share of truth they possessed at their inception

His school

The conspicuously literary action of this form of thought did not last very long. With Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860) it becomes almost entirely polemical. Julius Muller (1801-78), on the contrary, is rather devotional than intellectual. But the development and infinite ramifications of German theology are beside our purpose Even the interesting Catholic reaction, headed by such men as the poetical Counts of Stolberg (1748-1821 and 1750-1819), and the philosophic writer Franz Joseph Mohtor (1779-1860; *Philosophie der Geschichte*, 1827-53), which was so potent among literary workers, must not further detain us It is enough to realise that, during the earlier years of our period, theology of the school of Schleiermacher aided the other great

influences above sketched in producing a literary development which ran its course triumphantly to a certain point, but which—as we are now to see—received a severe check just when its difficulties seemed overcome, and its future bade fair still to be prosperous.

General results

The multiform and powerful impulses which acted on German thought during the first and second decades of our Century created a complex movement in pure literature—a movement partly of reaction, partly of excited aspiration The spirit embodied in this movement was essentially that of "Young Germany." Young men in most ages expect to make progress by transcending the ideals they find dominant. At the juncture to which attention must now be recalled such an expectation had more than usual probability How far it was fulfilled, in the persons of writers born at or shortly after the beginning of the Century, we are about to see That it should result in some deviation from, some hostile criticism of, the accepted Romantic ideal, some substitution either of practical earnestness or pessimistic scepticism, might almost have been predicted in advance.

Young Germany

The writers who called themselves "Young Germany" were brought up on Romanticism. Heine himself, their supposed leader, claimed emphatically to be a Romantic. An "unfrocked Romantic," some one had styled him; but while admitting the cleverness of the epithet, he protested that the second word was no less true than the

first. As Cervantes, a lover of chivalry, wounded it to death; so Heine (himself a great admirer of *Don Quixote*) loved the romance he satirised. A generation sooner, the Young German school would probably have been the keenest of anti-Classicists; but the natural swing of the pendulum impelled them against weak points on the other side. They were heirs of a revolution, therefore not themselves revolutionaries. A literary Revolution had come and gone, with Kant (the saying went) for its Robespierre, Fichte for its Napoleon, while Schelling represented the Royalist reaction. The analogy is not very striking, and leaves no place for the far more important work of Hegel. A revolution truly there had been. Young Germany accepted it, and asked, *what next?* They did not fall back on Goethe, whom they considered beautiful but sterile, coldly perfect in form, without the fructifying warmth of Schiller. Goethe's aristocratic hauteur, his insistence on art, his passion for objectivity, repelled them; they were Romantics in wanting something more personal, democratic, significant. But they did not find this something in popular "Romance." That aspired indeed to give the inner meaning of form, but they were sceptical of both form and meaning. So, though patriots, they were zealously cosmopolitan; free from the old hatred of France, and inclined to glorify the Napoleonic legend. Heine's earliest known poem, the famous "Two Grenadiers," said to have been written at the age of sixteen, has Napoleon for its hero. Shakespeare and Scott, Tasso and Cervantes, influenced them as much as did their own poets. But

the best way to understand the purport of their reaction is to study the work of Heine himself, by far the most remarkable of these young writers, indeed the only one who can claim more than merely local reputation

Heine

Heinrich Heine (1799-1856) was born and spent his school-days at Dusseldorf His family were Jews, but the Napoleonic occupation of Germany sent him to school in a Franciscan convent, which had been turned practically into a French *lycée* One of the fathers wished to make him a priest, and in later years he speculates amusingly on how he might have become first a Roman abbé, then cardinal, finally Pope! Other influences made him half French, notably that of the drummer Le Grand, with his martial enthusiasm and tales of the Emperor Actually, however, the only time he donned military uniform was as a volunteer in the uprising against Napoleon Intended for commerce, he entered a bank at Frankfort, then for three years did clerk's work at Hamburg, home of his rich and powerful uncle Solomon. Work and place alike proved distasteful, and eventually he was allowed to study for the bar, with a view to qualifying for a government post Seven years of student life (1817-24) were spent in Bonn, Gottingen, and Berlin, and were rewarded by a degree in jurisprudence; after which, to disarm prejudice, he accepted Christianity, being baptised in 1825. But the sacrifice proved fruitless, already his writings had given offence, and the appointment he sought went to another Indebted for subsistence to his uncle's grudging kindness,

during the next five years Heine wrote and wandered, visiting England in 1827 and Italy in 1828, but haunted by increasing ill-health, to relieve which he frequently tried North-Sea watering-places At Helgoland, in 1830, news of the "Revolution of July" fired his spirit, and next Spring he migrated to Paris, which for twenty-five more years he made his home His pen was seldom idle thenceforward "A radical in England, a carbonaro in Italy," he wrote eagerly on political matters, and more than coquetted with Saint-Simonianism His books were forbidden to be sold in Germany, he himself forbidden to cross the frontier. Two visits to Hamburg were made by stealth, under danger of arrest. Meantime, during many years, paralytic disease made constant progress, till at length he lay a cripple, powerless to move himself, blind except when he raised one eyelid by a finger, and often suffering acutest agony. Yet necessity and genius still urged him to write, and from that "mattress-grave," during a period of eight years (1848-56), came forth exquisite work both in prose and verse. At length death released from pain and toil, the wasted remains were laid in Montmartre Cemetery, "where at length there was peace"

His work.

From boyhood Heine had written verses They were more than mere boy's work, and in 1821 he published his first *Gedichte*, and was recognised a poet. Other volumes followed; in 1827 the completed *Buch der Lieder* fairly established him in the first rank Two tragedies, *Almansor* (acted 1824) and *Ratcliff*, were not very remarkable, though

the latter has some salient passages But the first and second volumes of *Reisebilder* (1826 and 1827) revealed his power as a prose-writer, and were warmly appreciated. The third and fourth volumes (1830 and 1831), dealing largely with politics and personalities, offended officialdom, and drew down his sentence of banishment. From that time onward, his chief note is cosmopolitan radicalism, his chief aim to interpret France and Germany to each other. Many of his books were published both in French and German, and in 1848 he superintended a French edition of his works, translating his German prose books himself, but enlisting for his poems the skilled aid of such friends as Gérard de Nerval. Thus books like *Allemagne* (1835) have an independent value in their French form, the prefaces being especially characteristic. His latest writings, *Deutschland* (1844), *Atta Troll* (1847), and *Romancero* (1851), were translated at once into French. And, since his death, French and German editors have vied in spending labour on a writer who belongs to both languages Thiers called him "the wittiest Frenchman of his time" But he was never naturalised, and remained German at heart

> "O Deutschland, meine ferne liebe,
> Gedenk' ich deiner, wein' ich fast"

For four years, he said sadly in 1835, he had not heard a German nightingale. Except, he might have added, the bird within, which sang in Paris as in London. "German poet" was the title of which he was proudest, for he held that in two regions, phil-

osophy and lyric poetry, Germans were supreme. The countrymen of Shakespeare must take exception to the second claim, but they hail in Heine a lyrist of very high order, though his method and individuality are singularly and perilously his own.

Effects of ill health

The long tragedy of Heine's later days throws a shadow over his whole life. Already, in young manhood, we see traces of disease. His health was never good, and bodily causes may have had much to do with his reckless satire. Yet he made warm friends, from his student days in Germany till the time when those who loved him could scarcely bear the sight of his wasted form. One such, a countrywoman of our own, has left a touching account of her last interview with the poet. Lady Duff-Gordon's narrative was lately made by a writer of powerful imagination the basis of a brilliant picture, which when it appeared in a magazine now defunct was treated by most reviewers as a piece of pure fantasy, few if any seeming to recognise its nucleus of fact. To that picture, now republished in "Dreamers of the Ghetto" (1898), one is tempted to refer as vividly reproducing Heine's personality, for the most part in his own words. And the reference may be extended to the *Autobiographie* of Prof. Karpeles (1888), mainly extracted from Heine's writings; and to the family recollections compiled by his nephew (*Heine's Familien-Leben*, Baron von Embden, 1892) and his grand-niece (*Ricordi della vita*, Principessa della Rocca, 1880). But the task remains of estimating Heine's resultant force and actual place in the history of his time; and

on this restricted and defined subject some words must now be said

Heine was first and foremost a lyrist Singing came naturally to him, and art was used to enhance nature

His method

The free metrification of the *Lieder* is not due to carelessness. In this country, the neo-Romantics tended to artistic elaboration; Heine, occupying a similar position, aims at a studious negligence. In the *Nord-See* poems he experiments with unrhymed lines, and is ever somewhat lax in structure. His favourite metre is the simple song-verse, written with an easy and even rough liberty. That liberty is the perfection of self-concealing art. His lines impress by what they say, rather than by how they say it, and suggest the careless growth of nature. But the barbed point is what above all bites, mixture of romance and satire constitutes Heine's method. Reckless and ironical, as ready to mock himself as others, he rarely lets you off without a cut of the whip, and loves with a sudden turn to leave you victim of his raillery. Nothing is sacred to him, no subject too tender or awful for jesting, in a moment his tricksy muse has donned cap and bells, and runs away laughing at your discomfiture

Reckless wit was the basis of Heine's character, combined with poet-grace and love of ideal beauty even when he flouted it. We may accept his own view that much of his early scoffing was *simple gamineric;* he flung stones at Heaven as a boy throws them at a policeman. But it was the same everywhere. Varnhagen von Ense,

Flouts and jeers

his friend and patron, was amused by Heine's offering to "fustigate" any one for him in the *Reisebilder*, he was ready to trounce for the sheer joy of trouncing So, when he wrote about Borne, love of mischief impelled him to drag in matters which should have been left in abeyance, and reference to which involved him in a duel. That duel, by the bye, had important consequences. In view of it he regularised an illicit connection, and saddled himself with a wife who could not speak German, could not appeal to his higher nature, but whom he tenderly loved, and who was admirably devoted to him through his years of final illness. Lady Duff-Gordon, again, is positive that his change of religious sentiment was deep and genuine. This recalls his own saying, "the thinkers die—or recant," and it seems fairer to judge him by what he was in his heyday than when the damps of death obscured his spirit But it may be doubted if the change was really so great. The famous passage about the "Aristophanes of Heaven" might have been written at any time of his life Heine was never fundamentally irreligious. The instinct of Israel was too strong in him, and even the "battle-god" of his fathers powerfully attracted his fancy. He might poke fun at this, as at every other conception in heaven or earth, but deep down in his nature there was a fund of inherited reverence, and all through life he claimed to be a soldier of the ideal, though a soldier who would wear no uniform, and obey no word of command but his own.

Not, of course, that he was devout in any ordinary

sense His attachment to Judaism was a matter of poetry and sentiment Nothing can be conceived more cold-blooded than his adoption of Christianity for a mess of pottage, jesting at the same time about the desirability of being a Japanese, because they abhorred the sign of the cross. But this was a mere piece of outward conformity, to be compared with our habit of compelling unbelievers to take religious oaths His friends Gans, Borne, Madame von Ense, had done the same, and would doubtless have ridiculed any scruples. He never concealed his real views, and adopted Lutheranism rather than Roman Catholicism because of its greater freedom and militant character. All this had nothing to do with his real faith That seems to have consisted in devotion to idealism and belief in the brotherhood of man, coupled with a vague sense of some superior Power, at whom it was thrilling to cast jibes, but whom he nevertheless reverenced somewhat after the fashion of Caliban.

Faith in the ideal

In this Heine much resembles Byron, though in few other respects. Heine neither posed nor affected mystery He lived like a bourgeois, even in youth neither smoked nor drank beer, while in Paris his ménage was of the simplest With his girlish face, grey-blue eyes, and winning smile, he might pass for a dilettante dreamer, but the scabbard hid a sword of steel Matthew Arnold's somewhat frigid conceit of Heine being the smile which played on the lips of the World-spirit, beholding the absurdities of men, is truer philosophically than poetically,

Lies a fighter

but it is only part of the truth. Heine not only smiled—he fought Through good or evil, love or hatred, health or sickness, his sword was ever ready He always "loved truth and detested falsehood," as he says himself; the latter especially with his whole power. In verse and prose of brilliant piquancy he fought for what seemed to him right His prose is almost more wonderful than his poetry. From Jean Paul, from Cervantes, from English writers whom he admired, while he hated their country, he doubtless borrowed hints. But the result is his own Except for a trick of discursiveness, which grew on him latterly, but which it is hard to wish away, his prose style is perfect of its kind. It is adequate to all subjects, from card-playing to metaphysics. How admirable, for instance, his account of Kant satisfactorily disproving the existence of Deity, then seeing his servant Lampe in tears, bethinking himself that Lampe must have a God, so invoking the "practical reason" of Lampe to supplement the "speculative reason" of his master It is excellent fooling, it is also excellent philosophical criticism, tersely and tellingly put Heine may not be a philosopher, but he can hit off the weak points of a philosopher to perfection On every subject, underlying his raillery, there is sound sense and useful criticism, put with such neatness as doubles its effect, and clothed in sentences which carry one along without wish or power to resist

Heine is the most modern of writers. The lapse of two generations has not made him old-fashioned Trappings of circumstance may change, but the inform-

ing spirit is fresh as ever. This, indeed, seems to sum up both his work and his influence—that he brought in the modern way of looking at things. The spirit which asks the *why* of every *wherefore;* which analyses its own enthusiasm, and is ready to debate any possible proposition, this spirit began with Heine. Others had shown it partially, in him first it was fully incarnated. This does not explain the charm of his writing, why his verse at least is so untranslatable. A stanza here and there may be converted, by a happy turn of accident, but in any prolonged attempt failure is certain. That, no doubt, results from the simplicity and apparent ease of his verse, which need a master of equal power to reproduce them in another language. But the thesis advanced above does seem to indicate why his work defined the end of a school. Pure romantic impulses could not stand against modern questioning. Once admit self-analysis, and the charm is broken. "The Rose and the Ring" spells *finis* to Romance. Heine was a Thackeray of far greater power and more mordant wit, and after him Uhland became impossible. Somewhat as a too good parody may kill our enjoyment of a fine passage, so Heine's satire killed Romance in Germany. The first Romantics had laid great stress on *irony*. Their successors found what a terribly potent weapon it was, when used against them. Not the shams and affectations merely, but the inmost reality of Romanticism, were thrust through and through by it. Poetry itself might well seem doomed, how write serious verse again on any theme which

Modern spirit

Heine had transfixed with his lightning-like mockery? At any rate the old forms, the old methods, could not serve longer; a new start must be made, fresh ground broken. The spear of a mortal's wit had wounded even celestial forms, and driven them from the field in confusion and terror.

Heine owned obligations to A. W. Schlegel, Hoffmann, Wilhelm Muller. To the last-mentioned, in 1826, he writes acknowledging his lyrical debt, and opining that their gift of song is in each case probably exhausted! Swift and Sterne were favourites of his. From *Don Quixote* (probably in Tieck's translation) he drank largely, and Richter unquestionably gave him much of his method. Scott and Byron became fashionable in Berlin about 1822, the former Heine pronounced our second poet (taking the novels into account), second only to Shakespeare. Dickens he read in later days, and greatly admired. From all these he may have taken hints, but the result remains his own. He is neither a Byron nor a Werther, neither dandy nor sentimentalist, but transfuses all he borrows into his own exquisite irony. If Jean Paul be "the unique" in one way, Heine is not less the unique, the incomparable, in his own selected field, and he not only defied rivalry at the time, he made it impossible for any one else to come after him in the regions he had seized for his own.

Unique result

Little has been said about individual books, because it seemed more important to emphasise Heine's general position. The *Buch der Lieder* can be easily sampled. The *Reisebilder* are now accessible in Mr Leland's

translation of Heine's prose works, as well as in the French version. The works of his middle-age, such as *Die romantische Schule* and *Philosophie und Literatur in Deutschland*, can be read either in French or German. His later books, *Neue Gedichte*, *Atta Troll*, *Romancero*, and three volumes of miscellaneous prose, should be studied in view of his alleged change of creed, notably the pieces entitled *Lazarus* in Part II of the last-named. But the point of first importance for us is to recognise that with Heine a new order begins, a line is drawn below past work, it is summed up and put away. Before Heine we are still in the reaction against the Eighteenth Century, in a time of wistful retrospect and sentiment and experimenting with old ideas, after Heine, we are fairly launched into the world of to-day.

Effect of his work

Of course this could not be so apparent at the time. Champions of the old order long went on fighting. Of Heine's fellow-workers—in the nature of things he could not found a school—only one or two need be named, and that without particularising their works. Heinrich Laube (1806-84) wrote poems and dramas, and was one of Heine's executors. Karl Ferdinand Gutzkow (1811-78) wrote dramas and novels, and had the honour of being imprisoned by the coercionist Government of 1835. Michel Beer (1800-33), another dramatist, is chiefly remembered by Heine's review of his *Struensee* (1829). None of these attempted lyric poetry at all seriously. The "Swabian School," on the other hand, whom Heine had compared

Fellow workers

to sardines lacking salt, were faithful to lyrics. Yet Wilhelm Hauff (1802-27) in his short life did more as novelist than as poet, his posthumously published *Märchen* being full of charm, while *Lichtenstein* (1826) is a novel after the manner of Scott. Eduard Mörike (1804-75) essayed *Volkslieder* as well as prose fiction, but hardly obtained more than a *succès d'estime*. The Austrian School had more to show. In addition to Nikolaus Lenau (1802-50), Nepomuk Vogl (1802-66), Gabriel Seidl (1804-75), and Adalbert Stifter (1806-68) —all singers of some repute—they could boast of three contemporary poets of noble birth, "Friedrich Halm" (1806-71), Ernst von Feuchtersleben (1806-49), and "Anastasius Grün" (1806-76). The last of these, whose real name was Anton Alexander Maria, Graf von Auersperg, may be fairly called the most considerable lyric poet Austria has produced. He was strongly liberal and pro-German, and wrote many political verses, of which *Spazier-gänge eines wiener Poeten* (1831) was one of the most popular. Of his longer poems, the allegorical *Schutt* (1836) is perhaps best known. The shorter were collected first in 1837.

In central Germany, the first decade of the Century gave birth to few singers of note. Philipp Spitta (1801-59), Georg Scheurlin (1801-72), Ludwig Bechstein (1801-60), Julius Mosen (1803-67), and Robert Reinick (1805-52) may be dismissed with bare mention. It is not till we come to Ferdinand Freiligrath (1810-76) that we reach any name of European celebrity. Born in humble circumstances, the success of his first book of poems (1838)

Freiligrath

decided his vocation for literature instead of commerce. His warm espousal of democratic views led to his having to leave Germany, and he settled in London, returning for a short interval after 1848 *Die Todten an die Lebenden* (1848), with *Ça ira!* (1846) and *Neuere Gedichte*, comprise his most important verses. His relations to England influenced his style, and he published translations of Tennyson, Longfellow, and other writers. Returning finally to Germany in 1868, he spent the rest of his days there, but did not take any prominent part in celebrating the War of 1870.

Freiligrath is rather a later scion of the patriotic school than a new voice in poetry. And we may scan in vain the names of writers born during the next twenty years for anything that can fulfil this description Auerbach and Freytag belong rather to prose fiction, and from Freiligrath to Paul Heyse (born 1830) the record otherwise is barren Friedrich Hebbel (1813-63), poet and dramatist, Gottfried Kinkel (1815-82), art-critic and lyrist, hero of a wonderful escape from the fortress of Spandau, Friedrich Wilhelm Weber (1813-94), translator of Tennyson's *Maud;* Emanuel von Geibel (1815-84), writer of plays and lyrics; Adolf Friedrich, Grab von Schack (1815-94), who tried most forms of verse, and the poet-theologian Karl von Gerok (1815-90), are the chief earlier names on the roll-call Georg Buchner (1813-37) may be added for his *Dantons Tod* (1835) and other plays. Most of these indeed are but dubiously included in our period, and the case is worse with Alfred Meissner (1822-85), in spite

Other singers

of *Gedichte* (1845) and an epic *Ziska* (1846), of Rudolf von Gottschall (born 1823), who published political poems as early as 1842. Even reckoning into account Freytag's plays (see below), the position assumed before, that after Heine's withdrawal came an interregnum in the kingdom of poetry, may be held sufficiently established by this recitation of names, and it is unnecessary to labour the point.

Later prose Auerbach and Freytag

In prose fiction the latter part of our period showed hardly more result. And even here the lead followed is not that of Richter or Heine, nor even of Goethe. Berthold Auerbach (1812-82), indeed, was a Jew, and began as a student of Spinosa, his first work being an essay on *Das Judenthum und die neueste Litteratur* (1836), followed by a romance based on Spinosa's life, and an edition of that thinker's works (1841). In 1836, moreover, he suffered imprisonment as a student Radical. So far he trod in Heine's footsteps, but his sketches of peasant life in the Black Forest (*Schwarz-Walder Dorfgeschichten*, 1843) show little of Heine's spirit or power, his later long romances come altogether after our period. Gustav Freytag (1816-95), again, after beginning with plays of conspicuous merit (*Die Valentine*, 1846, &c.), entered the field of novel-writing only in 1855, therefore cannot be dealt with here. No other youthful novelist seems to require separate mention. The humorous novel, by Heine's own confession, had not been naturalised in Germany. Nor was progress made with a more distinctly native

product, the philosophic or semi-philosophic romance. A certain heaviness, amounting almost to indigestibility, characterises the prose fiction of the years approaching 1850. Verisimilitude is attained, but it is not dramatic. Against dulness the gods themselves fight in vain, and even the best German novels of this period are familiar with dulness. The lesson of Heine had to be thoroughly learned; till then, vitality itself was somewhat dead-alive.

Struwwelpeter

A niche by himself must however be kept for Heinrich Hoffmann (1809-94), physician at Frankfort, author not only of lyrics and ballads (*Gedichte*, 1842) and satires (*Die Mondzuggler*, 1844, *Humoristen Studien*, 1847), but of the immortal *Struwwelpeter* ("Shock-headed Peter"), written to amuse his own children, published in 1847, translated almost immediately into English, which has since run through any number of editions, and given delight to countless readers both here and in its own country.

Critics

In criticism, to the end of our period, German writers retained their pre-eminence. Karl Joseph Simrock (1802-76), publicist and professor, combined the feeling of a poet with scholarly acumen in his modernisations of ancient poems, such as the *Nibelungenlied* (1827), *Reineke Fuchs* (1845), &c., &c., and his own *Gedichte* (1844) would have justified our classing him among poets. He also wrote many critical volumes, and translated plays of Shakespeare. Georg Gottfried Gervinus (1805-71), professor at Gottingen and Heidelberg, is eminent for his *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung* (1835-42),

and helped to found the *Deutsche Zeitung* (1847). To us, however, his main interest centres in his important Shakespeare-studies (1849-52), which have become a classic on the subject, and were soon translated into English Johann Hermann Detmold (1807-56) was a brilliant writer on art and politics, whose satiric *Randzeichnungen* (1843) and *Herr Pierpmeyer* (1849) created no small stir And Georg Friedrich Kolb (1808-84) was not only an energetic editor of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and other papers, but also wrote a *Geschichte der Menschheit und der Kultur* (1842), afterwards expanded into the more ambitious *Kulturgeschichte* of 1868-70 and later editions

History and theology

The succession of great historians was kept up by Heinrich von Sybel (1817-95), a pupil of Ranke's, professor mainly at Bonn, who did much excellent work before 1850, though his great *History of the Revolutionary period* (1853-58) belongs to the succeeding decade. Historical philosophy, or philosophical history, was illuminated by the labours of Eduard Zeller (born 1814) and Albert Schwegler (1819-57) The former, a son-in-law of Baur, began as Hegelian theologian, but published his greatest work, the well-known *Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* (1844-52), during the closing years of our period. His pupil Schwegler followed him both in early philandering with theology and in later neglect of it for such work as his compendious *Geschichte der Philosophie* (1848), so racily translated by Dr Hutchison Stirling Critical theology—for we

may be dispensed from tracing the long later succession of purely technical writers on theology, nor need delay even to notice such works as the important *Symbolik* (1832) of Johannes Adam Mohler (1796-1838)—showed also two prominent names, those of Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach (1804-72) and David Friedrich Strauss (1808-74), both keen polemists. Feuerbach's extreme views soon caused a reaction, and though his *Wesen des Christenthums* (1841) was translated into English by George Eliot, his other writings secured little assent. The *Leben Jesu* (1835) of Strauss, on the other hand (translated by the same), provoked great excitement both at home and here. He followed it up with several similar works, whose best claim to remembrance will perhaps be that they suggested Browning's picture of the German professor in *Christmas Day*, and inspired the far more delicate and sympathetic criticism of Rénan in France

Philosophy proper saw the rise to fame of Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) Though more than ten years older than Heine, and though *The World as Will and Idea* (1819) was published before Heine's first book, there is no evidence that he was known to the latter, and it was only toward the very end of our period that his writings began to attract attention. For this reason not much space need be given to him here Nor can it be deemed that his work, singularly able as it is in execution, either has attained or is like to attain

Philosophy Schopenhauer

honours reserved for what has greatly influenced the thought of an age Schopenhauer's ontological scheme is a paradox, and paradoxes as well as final causes are fortunately sterile Instead of a world constituted by reason, as Hegel taught, this later thinker saw in the universe only the working of a blind, non-moral will. "The will desired to live," and it lived; but no purpose is served by its living, and no law governs its action. So far from working for good, the drift of things is unmistakeably to evil, pessimism is the reward of thinking, and death the only cure of life. Such a creed deserves few converts Its logical issue is suicide, a conclusion which Schopenhauer himself showed no desire to draw He was not even careful to avoid bringing new sufferers into this world of misery Able as his whole argumentation is, no sane man can help doubting its validity The wisest minds in all ages have believed that this life of ours is not a chaos of chances, that it "means intensely, and means good" It is on the whole more probable that they are right than that the wisdom of the ages is less than our own Inordinate self-trust blinded Schopenhauer to the extreme doubtfulness of his main conclusion, but literary power and finish may be trusted to secure for his books a permanent place among the classics of metaphysic.

In Science the new ideas continued to bear fruit. Johann Muller (1801-58), professor at Bonn and Berlin, student of Goethe and Hegel, has been called

the founder of modern physiology, and his *Handbuch der Physiologie des Menschen* (1833-40) is regarded as a work of first importance Rudolf Wagner (1805-64), of Erlangen and Gottingen, a zoologist and physiologist of European note, wrote Hand-books of Anatomy (1834-35) and Physiology (1838), followed by the great *Handwörterbuch der Physiologie* (1843-52), but his later exploits as theologian and anthropologist fall without our survey. Ernst Heinrich Weber (1795-1878), professor at Leipzic, was an earlier worker in the same field, his brother, Wilhelm Eduard Weber (1804-91), a pupil of Gauss, became conspicuous as one of the seven Gottingen professors who suffered deprivation in 1837 through their adherence to the cause of reform These brief references may suffice to show that German science could show names of import to literature as well as to technical research, which is of course the sole justification of such names being mentioned on these pages

Physical science

In the various departments of didactic literature, therefore, Germany to the end of our period maintained her place of prominence among the nations In works of pure imagination it was otherwise. Heine's may be considered the one name of capital importance during the later twenty years of our epoch, he had no equal or rival, and he left no successor. With his work the Romantic Triumph in Germany comes to an end. It had had a long and delayed development, its final success was

Conclusion

widespread, its fall sudden and complete. To one man, with his keen perception and his merciless irony, this result was mainly due German Romanticism was slain by the satire of Heine. All general statements must be received with necessary caution, to this one, as to others, exceptions can doubtless be found. The atmosphere of the Fatherland is favourable to Romance. There the Romantic movement gathered strength, there its traces long remained, and probably linger to this day. The coming Century may even witness a revival of what had apparently passed for ever. Nothing is impossible in literature, and prophecy the most futile of amusements for a literary historian But, dealing only with the past, it is safe to assert that the outcome of this period, so far as imaginative letters in Germany are concerned, is contained in and bounded by the personality of Heine That elusive and enigmatic figure, with mocking smile on its lip and a sword of intolerable sharpness in its hand, dominates our whole view of the time, and no other figure stands long beside it. With Heine the old order ceases, the new begins. We pass from the vision and aspiration of earlier writers to the precision and clearness of a later school. The lights and shadows of romance merge in the common daylight of realism. How far German writers could do good work under these new conditions; whether, in particular, a new outburst of poetry was experienced or was possible while the method of Heine still retained its vogue, are questions which only too evidently lie beyond the limits of this chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROMANTIC TRIUMPH IN OTHER COUNTRIES

ITALY, INTRODUCTORY — ERA OF REVOLUTION — FOSCOLO — MANZONI — "PROMESSI SPOSI"—ROMANTICISM BEGUN—SCHOOL OF MANZONI — LEOPARDI HIS WORK—HIS INFLUENCE—REASONS FOR DECAY OF POETRY—GUERRAZZI—GIUSTI—OTHER POETS AND CRITICS—PHILOSOPHERS—HISTORIANS—SUMMARY AND RESULTS—SPANISH LITERATURE—PREDECESSORS OF ROMANTICISM—ROSA—RIVAS—HERREROS AND OTHERS—THE CLIMAX LARRA AND ESPRONCEDA—DIDACTIC WRITERS—GREEK LITERATURE—SWITZERLAND—DUTCH LITERATURE—LENNEP—YOUNGER WRITERS—FLEMISH LITERATURE—DENMARK—OEHLENSCHLÄGER—THORWALDSEN AND ANDERSEN—NORWAY—SWEDEN: LING AND TEGNER—ALMQVIST—RUNEBERG AND OTHERS—FINLAND—RUSSIAN LITERATURE—KRILOFF AND OTHERS—PUSHKIN—GOGOL—MICKIEWICZ—HUNGARIAN LITERATURE—ROMANTIC POETS—ROMANTIC PROSE-WRITERS—BOHEMIAN LITERATURE—ITS GREAT REVIVAL—END OF FIRST STAGE

Italy—introductory

THE literatures of Southern Europe did not exhibit the Romantic Revival in such decisive form as did those of Great Britain, France, and Germany. From Central Europe the impetus began, and it had lost some of its force when it reached regions remote from its source. Thus in Italy,[1] for example, the movement was assimilated

[1] Maffei, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, 2 vols (Florence, 1853)

and transformed at an early date, and during the period to which our consideration is limited it took the appearance rather of a second wave of revival, due largely to Byronic influence. Byron's residence in various parts of Italy, from 1816 to 1823, naturally gave strength to this impact of foreign ideas His romantic personality, his adoption of Italian habits of life and thought, heightened the spell of his writings Over all Europe Byronic influence was powerful at this time, it was especially so in Italy. A few introductory words will show at what stage of Italian literature Byron's potency began, how far it was a new element, and how far the years which we have to pass in review can be called in Italy those of Romantic Triumph

Era of revolution

The revolution-era which began with Alfieri may be said to have lasted till about 1815-20 During this time of transition, Italian writers were experimenting and innovating. The stir of the French Revolution, the ferment of Napoleonic occupation, the crash of thrones and governments, could not but be reflected in literature. Throughout this time of unsettlement foreign ideas rather excited than dominated Italy. She was self-absorbed, and her Classical predisposition did not favour an indigenous growth of Romanticism. Yet the translation

Mestica, *Manuale della letteratura italiana nel secolo XIX* (Florence, 1886), Étienne, *Histoire de la litterature italienne* (Paris, 1884), W D Howells, *Modern Italian poets* (London, 1887); *Manual of Italian Literature*, by Francis Henry Cliffe (London, 1896), *History of Italian Literature*, by Richard Garnett (London, 1898)

of "Ossian" (1763) by the Abbé Cesarotti is known to have influenced two writers about to be named. On the whole, however, the work of the revolutionist era was mainly negative. By airing new conceptions, and beating down blind conservatism, it cleared the field for a fresh growth; but up to the date when our period opens this new growth cannot be said to have taken definite shape.

Vincenzo Monte (died 1826) and Ippolito Pindemonte (died 1828), junior to Alfieri by but a few years, carried on what he began They were followed on more or less similar lines by Carlo Botta (1766-1837) and Pietro Colletta (1775-1831), both poets as well as writers of serious prose, while Albert Nota (1775-1847) belongs rather to the school of Goldoni, though among his forty-odd comedies two or three were founded on history. A more outstanding figure is that of Ugo Foscolo (1777-1827), intermediate in date between Alfieri and Manzoni. Greek by birth though Italian by adoption, soldier in youth and professor in middle life, Foscolo was more pagan than Catholic in ideas, but laid before antique shrines the homage of modern thought His very Classicism has something romantic at heart In ethics as in æsthetics, he would have men emancipate and self-centred. His early *Jacopo Ortis* (1799; enlarged later) was to Italian literature something of what *Werther* was to German, producing the same unsettlement of conduct as of imagination, and equally reflecting the fever of new ideas. His *Sepolchri* (1807), on the other hand, sounded a trumpet-call to Italian

Foscolo

patriotism. Exiled after 1816, he spent the last ten years of his life in England, doing much to make his national literature known in the land of his enforced sojourn.

These writers may be held to have paved the way for Romanticism; its chief inaugurator was Alessandro Francesco Tommaso Manzoni (1785-1873).

Manzoni

Milanese by birth, and come of a literary race, the young Manzoni spent two years (1805-7) at Auteuil, companion of Fauriel (*ante*, p. 203) and other French "ideologue" thinkers, and shared their beliefs and their scepticism. Returning to Italy, he married and lived for ten years quietly on his country estate, reconciled to the Church, and occupying his leisure mainly with religious writing. His lyrical *Inni Sacri* (1812 seq.) hardly require comment, any more than his juvenile *Trionfo della libertà* (1801) and elegy on Carlo Imbonato (1806) or the more ambitious *Urania* (1807-9), his *Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica* (1819), a prose treatise imposed on him by way of penance, had evidently also occupied much of his thoughts during these years of comparative idleness. But in 1818 he lost his property, and this misfortune roused him to fresh energy. The famous *Carmagnola* (1819) was first-fruit. In this play Manzoni anticipated Victor Hugo by setting at nought the Unities, and broke from the Classicism which had dominated his previous work. Shakespeare more than Byron was his model, though the latter probably contributed some influence, especially as regards the fine lyrics interspersed. The storm raised by *Carmagnola* travelled

far. Our *Quarterly Review* (vol xxiv) joined the fray, Ugo Foscolo perhaps inspiring the attack, Goethe replied in a Stuttgart paper, both in 1820. In 1821 came two odes, *Marzo* and *Cinque Maggio*, the latter —on the death of Napoleon—being translated into German by Goethe himself. And 1822 produced another play, the *Adelchi*, as successful as its predecessor, though trammelled by still closer adherence to history. But by this time Manzoni was breaking fresh ground with his last great work, the prose novel *I promessi sposi*, begun in 1820 or 1821, published 1825-27.

Promessi sposi

A novel which Scott is said to have pronounced "the best ever written," and which Goethe praised hardly less highly, rouses anticipation to the full. It is one of the common treasures of Europe, and readily accessible in English dress. Yet the English reader would be wise not to pitch expectance too high. The descriptions are certainly admirable. Years of study and observation went to compose those pictures of Lombard life, which are evidently sketched from his own experience, though the nominal date is thrown back more than a century. The central story, if not exactly thrilling, is sufficiently interesting. But to us, accustomed to a more intricately arranged plot, and greater brilliance of workmanship, the whole may well seem a trifle dull. The *longueurs* which are not wanting even in a "Waverley," the staid and sober tone, the somewhat artificial reflections, probably belong to the time, but they tend to tedium. *The betrothed ones* should be

studied historically, not read as a sensation tale. Historically regarded, it is full of interest One most remarkable fact is that neither the author nor any of his disciples ever rivalled this first success Manzoni hardly published anything after the *Sposi* Honoured and beloved, he survived for nearly forty more all but silent years, and Verdi's *Requiem* shows the feeling his death excited The followers who trod the path pointed out by him seldom became known beyond Italy To Italian prose and poetry, however, Manzoni's importance is great He saw clearly what change was needed. Before him there was groping, dubiety of principle, uncertainty of aim; the balance between Classic and Romantic hung even, as his own early writings clearly show. After him—or rather after the success of his two plays and his one novel—the die is fairly cast Italy, too, has taken Romanticism to heart The Revolution era may be held to have closed, the Romantic Triumph to have begun in its stead.

Romanticism begun

Manzoni himself, and his chief friends, were familiar with foreign literature. The principal writers named in next paragraph formed with him a group or school, for the most part personally acquainted with each other, and kindred in spirit They knew foreign authors in the flesh as well as by reading Schlegel, Niebuhr, Humboldt, Byron, and others had come individually into contact with them, and the result appears in their work. Manzoni, in particular, by his early training, and years of studious leisure, was in position to have undergone the teaching

of the great earlier Romantics. Scott and Goethe were his masters, and we have seen how each repaid his devotion in kind. If late in beginning, therefore, Italy might have been expected to make rapid progress in Romanticism. The conditions were favourable; the way had been cleared, and lay invitingly open. How far this promise was fulfilled will appear immediately.

School of Manzoni

Niccolini, Pellico, and Testa in tragedy, Nota (as above) and Giraud in comedy, Berchet and Rossetti in romantic lyric, Grossi and others in romantic "epic", in prose romance, Varese, Rosini, Azeglio, and many more, were some of the chief contemporaries or immediate successors of Manzoni. A few only of these need be further particularised. Giovanni Berchet (1783-1851) spent most of his days in exile, and his poems were only gathered into a volume on his final return (*Poesie italiane*, 1848 later edition, 1863). Gabriele Rossetti (1785-1854) fled from Naples to England, and there became father of our own illustrious poet and poetess. They are therefore scarcely fair specimens of the movement which was transforming native Italian poetry. On the other hand, Rossetti's contemporary, Gian Battista Niccolini (1785-1861), shows the process of change clearly. Between 1810 and 1817 he wrote many classical plays, while only *Mathilde* (1815) disclosed romantic leanings. Then he kept silence for ten years, before accepting the new ideas, which come out strongly in *Giovanni da Procida* (1830), and later with a difference in *Arnaldo da Brescia* (1845) and *Filippo Strozzi* (1847). Silvio Pellico (1789-1854)

also began with a classical *Laodamia* (1812 ?), but speedily went on to write *Francesca di Rimini* (before 1815) on romantic lines, and to edit the short-lived *Il Conciliatore* (1819). English readers know him by the book called *My Prisons* (*Le mie prigioni*, 1833), narrating his years of suffering as a victim of Austrian tyranny. After his release he abstained from controversial or compromising publications. Tommaso Grossi (1791-1853), another zealous patriot, is noteworthy for his romantic drama *Ildegonda* (1820), his epic poem on the Lombards (1826), and his later prose romance *Marco Visconti* (1834)[1]. The Marquis d'Azeglio (1798-1866) of the day, who married a daughter of Manzoni, sustained the traditions of his school in prose and poetry, beginning with a martial romance called *Ettore Fieramosca* (1833). A school had indeed been formed, and its methods were essentially Romantic. But a new writer of independent power, contemporary with Azeglio, came athwart them with a strain of very different inspiration, and developed the Byronic melancholy common to him and them into a darker mood wholly his own.

Leopardi

Giacomo, Count Leopardi (1798-1837), must be held one of the most extraordinary beings, as one of the most original intellects, of his time in Europe. Of noble family, living in country seclusion, an insatiable student, at the age of sixteen

[1] The Roman dialect used by Gioacchino Belli (1791-1863) prevents most foreign readers from enjoying his immense series of sonnets describing life in the old Papal City.

he had mastered three ancient and five modern languages, and six years later was pronounced by Niebuhr the first Hellenist in Italy These devouring studies did not engross his whole time; at the age of twenty he was known as a poet. The unexplained severity of his father denied him independence An early visit to Rome, where he did librarian's duty for some months, a later to Milan, editing Classic authors for a bookseller; were the only events of his youth. Rigorous confinement and over-study brought on terrible ill-health. Some peculiarly acute form of dyspepsia tortured his body and crippled his mind Yet in 1824 he published a volume of *Canzoni*, in 1826 of *Versi*, the latter modest title covering sonnets, idylls, and elegies. 1825 was spent at Bologna, 1827 at Florence, where he published his prose works under the title of *Operette Morali*. With these exceptions, he lived in his country home till 1830, when he published another volume of striking poems After that he was mainly a wanderer, and in 1833 settled at Naples with his friend and executor Ranieri. Four years later he died there suddenly, if not unexpectedly. A complete collection of his *Canti*, revised by himself, had appeared in 1836, and he left a just-finished satire, his *Sequel to the battle of the frogs and mice* (*Paralipomeni della Batracomiomachia*) His *Works* (4 vols., Florence, 1845) were edited by Ranieri, and have been often reprinted since; there is also a later volume of *Opere inedite* (Halle, 1878) His poems have been rendered into most European languages, as recently into English by Mr F. H Cliffe (London,

1893), his prose writings fill a volume of the *English and Foreign Philosophical Library* (1882) The homage of Musset and appreciation of Sainte-Beuve at an early date made his name familiar to French readers. Our fullest knowledge of him comes from his own letters, especially those to his mentor Giordani, and from the accounts more recently published by his niece (*Notes biographiques sur Leopardi et sa famille*, par Teresa Leopardi, Paris, 1881)[1]

Leopardi fills in Italian literature some such place as Heine in German, but with striking differences

His work

His total product is small in bulk. Some forty short poems, with the *Paralipomeni* and the essays, dialogues, and fragments of the *Operetti*, almost sum up his original writing His scholarly labours, the youthful work on Popular Errors of the Ancients, even the Greek Odes that took in his uncritical contemporaries, may be left aside Many of these studies remain unpublished; brilliant scholar as he was, they need hardly now be dragged to light. But his original work makes up in quality what it lacks in quantity From the first all is chiselled to perfection. The boyish *Appressamento alla morte* (1816), and the Odes to Italy and on Dante's monument (1819) which first made him famous, reveal already the artist. Romantic formlessness had no charms for him; he is classic in the highest sense, and a master of style. The tragedy of his life reflects

[1] Ranieri, *Setti anni di sodalizio con Giacomo Leopardi* (Naples, 1880), is a disagreeable book. Best recent edition of the poems, *Canti* (Florence, 1892).

itself in his verse. Death and decay are habitual themes. The hopes of his generation, vigour of patriotism and fervour of idealism, leave him untouched. Even Stoic pride, and the *sensus communis* of mankind, are wanting in his pages. Disappointed hedonism turns to bitterness and despair. Did we not know its origin, Leopardi's melancholy might seem mainly despicable, as it is selfish and non-human. Aware of the conditions which caused it, we can sympathise and compassionate, but must still regard his poems as dealing their death-blow to his theories. Pessimism such as this revolts while it disillusions We feel that life is made of nobler, if sterner, stuff than he recognises But if the subject-matter of Leopardi's essentially fugitive poetic pieces be as flimsy as it is sorrowful, their style and execution excite only to praise. His upbraidal of fate is clothed in form the most exquisite, in language the most noble. Perfection of art makes us forget all else in admiring the artist. This railer at destiny has the lips of Apollo.

His influence

The influence of Leopardi was hostile to that of his chief contemporaries. They sing of life and love, hope and faith in humanity, he of despair and death Manzoni and Leopardi stand against each other as representatives of light and darkness How far the latter was directly affected by Byron seems uncertain, as how far he knew of Shelley, whose residence in Italy coincided with Leopardi's most fruitful years With a scholar so distinguished, a student of English as of German, the

presumption is that he knew of their writings. At all events, Leopardi's poems accentuated the Byronic tendency, which made itself strongly felt henceforward Romanticism was confronted by a rebel in its own household. Classic in form of utterance, the world-weariness of Leopardi is but too closely allied to Romantic egoism and lawlessness; it reduces to absurdity the insubordination and self-absorption which were the weak points of the new movement His all-embracing pessimism incited to search for an antidote, nor had he Heine's quick humour and merciless raillery to barb his spear, and make the wounds it inflicted fatal. Romanticism survived Leopardi, as it did not survive in Germany the irresistible onslaught of his contemporary But it was profoundly affected, and conveyed that affection to other nations, most of all to France, the natural neighbour and linguistic ally of Italy. No name of equal importance follows Leopardi's within the limits of our survey, he scarcely founded a school, but he influenced all who came after. Romanticism could never again feel the thoughtless joyance of youth, nor contentedly neglect severer canons of form and expression

Reasons for decay of poetry

During the remainder of our period Italian poetry languished and declined. Manzoni and Leopardi had no successor for well-nigh a generation. Political causes go far to explain this. The years which followed 1815 did not bring to Italy, as to France, a season of joyful progress.

Buonapartist rule was replaced by more familiar oppression King, Pope, and Emperor resumed their old stations, and vied in crushing independent thought Exile or imprisonment awaited any critic of established order. It is remarkable that the works already mentioned as appearing about 1819-20 were allowed to take the shape they did; and in fact their writers rarely escaped some kind of political martyrdom. As time went on, things grew steadily worse. From 1830 to 1848, the rigour of administrative severity became extreme Men dared not write down, much less publish, anything which could be misconstrued. This intolerable pressure was met politically, by the development of secret societies; in literature, clandestine publication formed the only alternative to decorous acquiescence. It would have needed a Rabelais to combine outward conformity with freedom of criticism or creation. Small wonder, then, if the growth of imaginative literature was stifled, if we have to look on to Giosué Carducci (born 1836) before we find a successor to Leopardi This fact is all-important in estimating the progress of Italian Romanticism. The years when it should have flourished were years when freedom was impossible And freedom of thought was the very basis of the Romantic movement. In dealing with the names that follow, few and comparatively unimportant as they are, it must be borne in mind that the natural leaders of progress were silent or banished, and that any attempt to emulate their utterance drew down severest penalties.

Francesco Domenico Guerrazzi (1804-73), who in youth met Byron at Pisa, was one of the few that remained faithful to literature. And he did not escape scatheless, being several times imprisoned and twice exiled to Elba His numerous plays and novels follow Manzoni's lead with an added element of spontaneity and humour *La battaglia di Benevento* (1827) in prose fiction, an ode to Byron and a tragedy *Priam*, preceded his first sentence of exile in 1828, *Isabella Orsini* (1834) and *Orazione funebre* (1835) his second Another play, *I Bianchi ed i Neri* (1847), to which are appended translations from Schiller and Byron, heralded his appearance as a political leader in 1848 How he fared in those days of storm and tumult may be read in any history of the time, and in his own *Apologia della vita politica* (1850) In literature as in politics, he was more ambitious than successful, but deserves the credit of not having despaired of his country in either capacity.

Guerrazzi.

Giuseppe Giusti (1809-50) fills a place by himself, of greater prominence than he could have reached in a happier time For he was bold enough to write satires, which were handed about in manuscript, the author's name being kept strictly secret The first of these was *La Ghigliottina* (1833), closely followed by *Il Dies Irae* (1835), inspired by the death of the Emperor Francis I ; while *Gingillino* (1847) is considered his ablest performance. Their author was a lawyer, in name at least, son of a rich father, who had idled through a prolonged student-

Giusti

ship, and finally established himself at Florence; and his daring skits mask republican zeal under the wit of a man of the world His *Versi* were first printed in 1845, the completer edition of 1852 contains eighty-seven pieces. Some of them have been rendered into English by Mr W. D. Howells. Giusti's boldness has secured him a niche in the history of his time; but his satires were naturally ephemeral, and in other fields he made no attempt

If we add the ballads of Luigi Carrer (1801-53); some pieces by Cantù, to be named presently as a prose-writer, the fanciful verses of Aleardo Aleardi (1812-78), and the patriotic songs of Giacomo Zanella (1820-89), we seem to have included all that is noteworthy in Italian poetry proper. Giovanni Prati (1815-84), an Italian Tyrolese, may come here in virtue of his narrative poem *Edmengarda* (1841), which clearly reveals a Byronic model In poetical criticism, two names are especially prominent During the first part of our period, Pietro Giordani (1774-1848) corresponded with the chief authors we have named, as later with Leopardi, and powerfully influenced all departments of *belles lettres*. During its closing portion, Niccolo Tommaseo (1802-74) filled a similar position of influence and importance. But none of these writers had much weight beyond local or national boundaries

Other poets and critics

More important work was done in other fields. Pasquale Galluppi (1770-1846) practically introduced Kantian thought into Italy, and may be called the

father of modern Italian philosophy, by his *Elementi di filosofia* (5 vols, 1820-27) Among the many who either followed or shared his impulse,[1] two writers stand out chiefly prominent Antonio Rosmini-Serbati (1797-1855) founded a school of thought and a rule of life which are potent still, and his *Nuovo saggio sull' origine delle idee* (1835) was the first instalment of an encyclopædic system His philosophy and his political teaching were both impugned at the Vatican, but he succeeded in vindicating both, and remained throughout loyal to and accepted by the Church. His works in twenty-two volumes (seventeen at Milan, 1842, five more posthumous) are represented to English readers by a translation of the above-mentioned treatise (London, 1883-84), of the *Sistema* by Thos. Davidson (London, 1882), with memoir and bibliography, and other excerpts, while the *Life* edited by Father Lockhart (London, 1886) adds a record of the man and his time, based on the official biography by Don Francesco Paoli (Rome, 1880) His principal opponent, Vincenzo Gioberti (1801-52), less fortunate than he, was banished in 1833, and wrote his chief books at Brussels in exile and poverty. His *Introduzione* (1839) and *Errore filosofici di Antonio Rosmini* (1842) were less important than the great *Primato civile e morale* (1843) and the popular *Gesuita moderno* (1846-47), which brought about his triumphal return to Italy

Philosophers.

[1] The eclecticism of Terenzio Mamiani della Rovere (1800-85), like that of Cousin in France, was directly influenced by the Scottish school of philosophy

in 1848 and temporary premiership in the Piedmontese cabinet. Soon driven from power, he again left Italy, to spend the brief residue of his days quietly in Paris

History naturally received much attention, and Gioberti had many predecessors and successors in this study. Several writers previously mentioned as poets demand record here also. Thus Botta published a *History of Italy from* 1789 *to* 1814 (10 vols, Paris, 1824), which gained a prize from the Academia della Crusca Colletta contributed a history of Naples, Testa one of the Lombard League, Azeglio made historical sketches the vehicle for denunciation of Papal and Austrian misgovernment Carlo Troya (1784-1858) devoted himself to the Middle Ages But the names of most interest in this department are perhaps those of Balbo and Cantù Cesare, Count Balbo (1789-1853), a cousin of Azeglio's, and colleague with him and Gioberti in the cabinet of 1848, was driven to literature by political restriction Beginning with *Quattro novelle* (1829) and a *Sommario della Storia d'Italia* (1830), and then for some years occupied with a *Vita di Dante* (1839), he achieved his chief success in *Speranze d'Italia* (1843), a book called forth by Gioberti's *Primato*. The politics of both books belong to the past, and neither writer dared anticipate complete deliverance or national unity, but both books had educative force and stimulus at the time Cesare Cantù (1807-95), nearly twenty years younger than Balbo, was more the literary man by profession His early poem *Algiso* (1828) and novel

Historians

Margherita Pusterla (1837), with his studies of Byron, Victor Hugo, and several German poets, might have led to previous mention; but his chief work was historical, and the great *Storia Universale* (35 vols, Turin, 1837 *seq*) will always bulk largest among his titles to fame His later separate books, in which a reactionary tendency contrasts with the tone of his earlier work, hardly concern us here

Summary and results

The influence which Italy exerted on European literature during the first half of the Nineteenth Century was not inconsiderable If Manzoni and Leopardi alone became household names, part of the common literary possessions of an international commonweal, other writers and other ideas made themselves felt individually or collectively. The long struggle for Italian liberty secured sympathy in all quarters, while the "Exiles of Italy" (to use the title of a once well-known book) carried an object-lesson of its sufferings to the lands where they sojourned France and Germany shared their hopes and ideals, Great Britain had a hereditary interest in them, not confined by ties of party or creed The man who summed up and directed and gave shape to these cosmopolitan sympathies was Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-72) Even as a writer, Mazzini takes no mean place in his time, as teacher and preacher, he is a force of the mightiest. Politics have no place in these pages, and whether the influence be exerted for or against freedom of thought, by a Mazzini or by a Rosmini, it must be equally noted and weighed The four names mentioned in this paragraph seem those

which were of most European importance in the Italy of our period. Manzoni and Leopardi represent her contribution to pure literature, Rosmini and Mazzini to those profound movements of thought which shape men's minds, and condition their literary work. Home of ancient beliefs and long-descended ideals, Italy in this crisis of her fortunes attracted notice far beyond what her actual literary output deserved. Early speeches of Mr Gladstone, passionate devotion of Browning and his wife, reflect to us some idea of a feeling dominant throughout England, and widely shared abroad Garibaldi ranked with Kossúth as a popular hero The traditional importance of Italian literature suffered temporary eclipse before the predominance of German. But it retained many votaries, and remained always a potent secondary force The wave of Romanticism which overspread Europe received notable accession from Italian sources, even if in herself Italy did not originate or even continue an independent Romantic school.

Spanish literature

Spain[1]—and henceforward this report must be almost entirely at second-hand, as it has been in places even heretofore—Spain was in many respects the land where a Romantic school might have been expected to flourish She had a prepared soil, and inherited proclivities. Hers were

[1] Ticknor's *Spanish Literature*, vol iii (Boston, 1872); Hubbard, *Histoire de la littérature contemporaine en Espagne* (Paris, 1876), *Modern Poets and Poetry of Spain*, by James Kennedy (London, 1852), *History of Spanish Literature*, by James Fitzmaurice Kelly (London, 1898), *Coleccion de escritores Castellanos* (Madrid, 1882-94)

old romances without number, hers the dress and climate, the manners and ideals, that suited this form of literature, the very word *Romancero*, so dear to Hugo and his followers, came from her That word was itself an inspiration, a reminiscence of mediæval heroism. Yet, with so much to urge, she lagged rather than led in the European movement Even her great struggle against Napoleon created no national literature. The French models which had dominated her Classic period were not rejected by the men who summoned to war against France. Revolutionary manifestoes affected conservative form Luzán's influence was still all-powerful, half a century after his death The English alliance produced apparently no effect whatever on letters. Only gradually, and for the most part by reflection from France, did Romantic ideas find their way into a country where they might have been imagined native. We can therefore afford to deal shortly and in outline with what, according to the best authorities, seems to have been a movement of only derivative and secondary significance.

Predecessors of Romanticism

Jovellanos died in 1811, Meléndez in 1817 These, with Leandro Fernandez Moratin (died 1828), were the chief magnates of the previous generation, and left a gap not soon filled. They represent the Classical French school at its height, though Moratin travelled much, and must have come across the new ideas Their most immediate successor was Manuel José Quintana (1772-1857), a prolific author of odes, tragedies, and didactic poems,

but best remembered by his patriotic verses and his prose biographies of the Cid, &c. In literature he remained wholly faithful to the old methods, professing himself always a pupil of Meléndez. On the other hand, Alberto Lista (1775-1848) showed anti-classical leanings, less in his own verses (*Poesías*, 1822) than in his career as a teacher. His *Lecciones de Literatura Española* (1839), still more his *Ensayos literarios y críticos* (1844), gather up ideas which he had long impressed on his pupils (of whom Espronceda was the most distinguished) in favour of antique national forms. Juan Nicasio Gallega (1777-1853), cleric and liberal, published some fiery patriotic appeals, notably *A la defensa de Buenos Aires* (1807) and *El Dos de Mayo* (1808), the former being directed against the alliance with Great Britain. Of these three writers, the first who are properly within our limit, Lista alone has affinity to Romanticism, and he by precept only, not by example. For its first appearance in practice we must look to a much later date, and to authors who reached maturity towards or after the termination of the Buonapartist régime.

Rosa

The oldest of these was Francisco Martínez de la Rosa (1789-1862). Famous in his day both in literature and politics, Rosa interests now mainly as showing the transition process begun. His earlier lyrics echo Meléndez and Quintana, his epic poem *Zaragoza* (about 1813) is of the old school in subject and manner. There is indeed little originality in any of his work, high as it ranked in its time. Its importance to us begins with his

exile to Paris. While resident there about 1834, he published two distinctly Romantic plays, the *Conjuración de Venecia* and *Aben-Humeya*. These are evidently inspired by Hugo and Lamartine, and his later novel, *Doña Isabel de Solis* (1837-40), is as clearly moulded by Scott. Though Rosa was the oldest, he was not the earliest of these writers to adopt the new canons, and here also may be held to have followed rather than led. But his prominent position gave weight to his example, and the pieces last named had influence beyond what their intrinsic merits perhaps deserved.

Foreign contact was still more evident in Ángel de Saavedra, duque de Rivas (1791-1865) Exile came earlier in life to him, and introduced him to the poems of Chateaubriand in France, of Byron in England. We find him in the latter country about 1824, associating with Frere, and composing at the latter's suggestion an epic poem, *Florinda*. His youthful *Ensayos poéticos* (1813), the new pieces contained in *Poesías* (2 vols, 1820-21), with his narrative poem *El Moro expósito* (1834), show successive stages of a development which culminated in his play *Don Álvaro* (1835), whose publication was an event like that of *Hernani* in France. Rivas thus derives from the English movement as well as the French, a point worth emphasising here as elsewhere, in view of efforts to represent Spanish Romanticism as purely a copy of French. And in him we first encounter the influence of Byron, so powerful on the two abler writers soon to be named.

Rivas

A considerable interval, however, elapses between Rivas and this pair of leaders, an interval filled by some names of less importance. Thus Manuel Bretón de los Herreros (1800-72), a pupil of Moratín, is more remembered by his tragic death than by *El Carnaval* (1833), or the *Escuela del Matrimonio* (1850?) "Fernan Caballero" (Cecilia Bohl de Faber, 1796-1877) was so late of entering the lists that her first and best-known novel, *La Gaviota*, appeared only in 1848. Serafín Estébanez Calderón (1799-1867) anticipated her by several years with his *Escenas Andaluzas* (1836? fourth edition, 1847), which, like his poems signed *El Solitario* (1833 and 1840), are laboured and affected A younger and more spontaneous writer, Ramon de Mesonero Romanos (1803-82), amused the capital with his lively *Escenas Matritenses* (1845) All these writers, though earlier in birth, seem derivative rather than original beside the leaders above referred to. Only Manuel de Cabanyes (1808-33), with his one volume of *Preludios* (1833), in his short life struck a fresh note of execution if not conception; and him the Fates removed with lips scarce unsealed.

Herreros and others

Prose and poetry have not been separated in the foregoing paragraphs; they come together again in the two chief names of our period, Larra and Espronceda. Mariano José de Larra (1809-37), the "Figaro" of Spanish journalism, stands out a captain of prose. In his short and stormy life, closed by his own hand as the sequel to some love-

The climax: Larra

affair, he essayed little else, and his tales and plays, of which *Maclas* (1834) is best known, do but echo foreign models But his occasional writing was a power of the first rank. Born and educated in France, he seems to have grafted the qualities of her younger writers on to the now modified Spanish stock, and like them to have been influenced by Byron, Heine, and Leopardi His cosmopolitan training left no national prejudice to overcome, and he adopted the new points of view without reserve Brilliant and accomplished, he created a school of writing if not of thought, and reminds of Leopardi rather than of Byron in his attitude of criticism With him the old school has wholly passed away, he is modern and European, and though dying before thirty left an indelible mark on his country's literature.

and Espronceda

Almost exactly of age with Larra, and not dissimilar in tone, José de Espronceda (1810-42) accomplished more permanent work, and may be called the chief writer of Spain's Romantic school. Yet he survived Larra but five years The early death of these her two greatest writers robbed Spain of natural leadership at this crisis of her literature Espronceda is perhaps more exactly akin to Musset than to any of the three foreign writers named in last paragraph. The Byronic pose is the same, and the lyrical rather than dramatic nature, his comedy too is more happy and spontaneous than his tragedy. Espronceda's serious plays do not count for much, nor is his novel *Don Sancho Saldaña* (1834) highly

spoken of, but his short poems have the characteristic Romantic egoism and passion Like Larra, he was cosmopolitan and revolutionist, lived abroad for ten years (1823-33), made acquaintance with Byron's poems in London, fought on the barricades at Paris in 1830, aided Liberalism at home later with sword and pen, and shared its triumph in 1840. Among his best-known works are *El Estudiante de Salamanca*, dealing with the national *Don Juan* legend, *El Verdugo* (*the Executioner*), and the witty but fragmentary *El Diablo Mundo* (1841). Collected before his death, his works in prose and verse were more recently edited by his daughter (Madrid, 1884), and are accessible in various forms

Imaginative literature suffered an irreparable blow by the premature death of these two leaders The *Didactic writers* authors mentioned before them still went on writing, but unless we include the earlier work of José Zorrilla (1817-93), no new name of importance emerges during the rest of our period Criticism was represented by Lista and by Augustin Duran (1789-1862), history by several works of merit, such as Calderón's *Conquista y Perdida de Portugal* (posthumous) In philosophy, two writers contemporary with Larra and Espronceda took the first place Juan Francesco Maria Donoso-Cortés, Marqués de Valdegamas (1809-53), and Jaime Balmes y Uspia (1810-48), both wrote works defending Catholicism, the latter against Protestantism, the former against Liberalism and Socialism Both aimed at the same end, but the haughty intolerance of Donoso, a Spanish noble of the

most unyielding type, is less likely to persuade than the hyper-subtle ratiocination of Balmes, an ecclesiastical casuist of keenest intellect, author also of two books on pure metaphysic. Even these names can hardly be said to be of European importance, and there is no other to place beside them. Whatever, therefore, Spanish literature might have done had Cabanyes, Larra, and Espronceda been longer-lived, its actual accomplishment during our period was narrowly restricted, nor does it seem certain that any of its authors had real unborrowed power, or could ever have risen to be more than a brilliant reproduction of the best foreign models and exemplars

Greek literature

The third Southern peninsula of Europe—that of Greece—contributed to the European movement rather by ancient example than by modern production Her folk-songs and popular verses were widely studied, Fauriel's versions[1] in particular making them known through Western Europe. And there was much to attract in the effort she made to restore what was practically a mere dialect to its place as an independent language But her contemporary writers were few and unimportant, and more busied with translating foreign authors or editing their own classics than with new departures. The names of Gennadios, Soutzos, and Salamos stand out most prominent, but only

[1] *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne* (Paris, 1824, English translation, 1825)

by comparison. History and archæology received special attention, and perhaps Spyridon Trikupis or Tricoupi (1788-1873), statesman and scholar, need alone be particularised for his travels abroad, his service as a young man in the War of Independence, and his eminence later as historian of the events which he had helped to shape

Switzerland

Passing up through Central Europe, we are reminded that several leading writers have been dealt with already, being classed by language rather than by birthplace Thus Constant, Sismondi, and Vinet are no longer left to come under the head of French Switzerland, while German and Italian Switzerland, Tyrol, and even Austria, have given their chief names to illuminate our German and Italian roll-calls It is hardly necessary to go through lesser celebrities, to enumerate the poems of Tanner, Frohlich, Gotthelf, or Hagenbach, the novels of Topffer and Appenzeller, or do more than take note of *Alpenrosen* (1811-31) edited by Johann Rudolf Wyss, author of the national hymn *Rufst du, mein Vaterland*, and of the book known to ourselves as the "Swiss family Robinson" More Eastern literature, again, is best left to come in with Russian. From the South of Europe therefore we pass at once to the farther North, where a movement of well-marked proportions, and reacting not inconsiderably on various nations of Europe, was in progress during nearly the whole of our period.

In the Netherlands,[1] indeed, this movement was retarded and partially thwarted by personal causes The example and high authority of Willem Bilderdijk (died 1831) still dominated Dutch literature, and championed French classical methods against the inrush of German romanticism Younger poets were too slight or too modest to lead war against him Antonin Staring (1767-1840) published his first poems in 1820, and then rather as a follower of others than a leader Hendrik Tollens (1780-1856) confined himself mostly to patriotic songs and ballads (*Gedichten*, 3 vols, 1808-15, *Nieuwe Gedichten*, 1821), with one long descriptive poem about Nova Zembla (1816) His friend and pupil Willem Messchert (1790-1844) is remarkable but for one "domestic" study, the *Gulden Wedding* (1825) More original and forceful than any of these, Adrianus Bogaers (1795-1870), who seemingly had it in him to be Holland's great Romantic poet, absolutely shrank from publication, his few pieces coming out as by stealth *Jochebed*, privately printed in 1835, is said to have been written thirteen years before; *Heemskerk's Voyage to Gibraltar* (*De Togt van Heemskerk naar Gibraltar*), published in 1836, with a privately printed volume of *Ballads and Romances* ten years later, completes his literary record. It is only by

Dutch literature

[1] Schneider (Louis), *Geschichte der niederlandischen Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1888), Jonckbloet, *Geschiedenis der nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Groningen, 1868, German translation, Leipzig, 1870-72); Jan ten Brink, *Kleine Geschiedenis der nederlandsche Letteren* (Haarlem 1887)

degrees that Bogaers has taken his rightful place, advancing perhaps in estimation as Bilderdijk declines, and in poetry at least the influence of Holland during our period cannot be said to have been considerable

In prose she was more prominent. For Jacobus van Lennep (1802-68), rising early to fame, remained throughout a prolific and successful writer He began in verse with translations from Byron and *Academic Idylls* (1826), made his mark with *Nederlandsche Legenden* (1828) and two comedies, but conquered criticism only with his prose *Ploegoon* (*Adopted Son*, 1829), first of the long series of historical novels which gave him a place in Dutch literature comparable to Scott's in our own. Most of these have been translated into several European languages, in English we have the *Adopted Son*, *Rose of Dekama*, *Count of Talavera*, &c Other dramas, too, followed, and a Dutch History for children, again reminding us of Scott But the novels formed his chief work, and it is in virtue of these that critics rank him leader of Holland's Romantic school. His *Poetische Werken* (11 vols, 1859-62) comprise translations from English poets as well as original compositions; his *Romantische Werken* (23 vols, 1855-72) contain the substance of his real contribution to European literature.

Lennep

Nor did the school led by Bogaers and Lennep long continue to flourish The "domestic" tone already noted in one writer tended to exclude the Romantic. Thus Nicolaas Beets (born 1814) turned

from the Byronic melancholy of *José* (1834) and *Kuser* (1835) to give in *Camera obscura* (1836, afterpiece added, *Na vijftig jaar*, 1887) a Dickens-like picture of men and manners. Johannes Pieter Hasebroek (born 1812), clergyman and poet, both in his *Poezy* (1837) and his prose *Truth and Dreams* (1840) reminds faintly of Charles Lamb. Criticism was combined with poetry by the slightly older Everhard Johannes Potgieter (1808-75), who in 1837 founded that excellent magazine *De Gids*, and with his friend Bakhuizen van den Brink (1810-65) directed Dutch letters by precept and example. His own poems are deeply tinged with mysticism. Even when strong English tastes revealed themselves, as in the *Three Tudors* (1847) of Hendrik Jan Schimmel (born 1824), they took a garb and colour other than Byronic. The tumult of Romanticism did not either long or fundamentally affect the course of Dutch literature, which pursued its placid way but slightly affected by influences so powerful elsewhere.

Younger writers

In Belgium, it need hardly be said, French was still predominant, and the writers who employed that language have in this volume been regarded as French authors. The use of the native Dutch or "Flemish" tongue for literary purposes may be said to have begun during our period, the first pioneer of importance being Karel Lodewijk Ledeganck (1805-47). His collection of poems, *Bloemen mijner Lente* (*Flowers of my Springtide*, 1839), still more his verses on the "sister cities" of Ghent, Bruges, and Antwerp (*De drie Zustersteden*, 1846), had a popu-

Flemish literature

larity only equalled by the early books of a much more voluminous author seven years his junior. But though several volumes by Hendrik Conscience (1812-83) appeared during the time we have in review, his complete work must be left for treatment as a whole in the volume following this. More appropriate matter lies to hand in neighbouring countries

Scandinavian literature had contributed its element to the Romantic revival in other countries, and was now receiving back a wave of foreign Romantic influence Especially in Denmark,[1] most southerly of the three allied nations, did this influence prevail Her chief poet, Adam Gottlob Oehlenschlager (1779-1850), had been converted at one sitting to Romantic theories by Steffens (*ante*, p. 305), just returned from Germany. Throwing previous poems into the fire, he set to work on new lines, and from 1805 to 1810 travelled in his turn on a government grant, visiting Weimar, Dresden, and Berlin, spending a year and a half in Paris, and winding up with a long stay in Rome. In 1810, his wanderings over, he settled at Copenhagen as professor of æsthetics, adding to poems published before his journeyings (such as *Thors reise til Jotunheim*, &c), or during them (such as *Hakon Jarl*, first of a long series of dramas), his best and richest work,

Denmark

[1] Schweitzer, *Geschichte der skandinavischen Literatur* (Leipzic, 1886-89); *Dansk poetisk Anthologi*, 3 vols (1830-40), Bricka, *Dansk biografisk-lexicon* (1887 seq.), *Denmark and Iceland*, by E C Otté (London, 1881)

notably that which appeared in *Helge* (1814). If the next years of his life were embittered by controversy, the clouds cleared later, and in 1829 his Swedish contemporary Tegnér crowned him in Lund Cathedral king of Scandinavian song, after which for still twenty years he reigned in undoubted supremacy.

Oehlenschlager

A Dane born and bred, Oehlenschlager so steeped himself in foreign literature that one of his books (*Correggio*, 1809) was drafted in German. Yet he remained intensely national, taking his subjects from Norse history or mythology, and making the legends of his own land known through Europe. Nationality was the watchword of the revival in Denmark, spite of foreign culture and foreign models. It had begun largely with antiquarian and philological research, in which Rasmus Christian Rask (1787-1832) took prominent part, his *Dansk Retskrivningslære* (1826) remaining a monument of erudition. It inspired in very different fields the brothers Oersted, of whom Hans Christian (1777-1851) was a distinguished naturalist, while Anders Sandoe (1778-1860) attained equal renown as a historical jurist. With Rask should be coupled Christian Molbek (1783-1857), his compeer in studies later carried to such perfection by Johann Nikolai Madvig (1804-86). But our concern is mainly with imaginative literature, and there the revival showed itself most strongly. Oehlenschlager's opponent Jens Baggesen (1764-1826) might cling to Classic traditions, as in his idyllic epic *Parthenais* (1812), younger men followed the new lead heartily. Paul Martin Moller

(1784-1838) in lyric, Bernhard Ingemann (1789-1862) in drama and novels Johann Carsten Hauch (1790-1872) in romantic verse and prose of many kinds, exemplified this new departure. If sometimes opposed to foreign influence, as in the case of Nikolai Grundtvig (1783-1872) it was for the most part cosmopolitan as well as national, replacing the narrow horizon of previous generations by a generous width of outlook, but enlisting all borrowed influences in the development of Danish patriotism

Thorwaldsen and Andersen

Apart from the general current of this revival, two men of surpassing genius made Denmark and themselves famous Bertel Thorwaldsen (1770-1844), the illustrious sculptor, can be mentioned here only in virtue of the great influence his works exercised on the literature of a land which saw him seldom after youth, and of his companionship with Oehlenschlager during the latter's Roman visit But Hans Christian Andersen (1805-75), one of the generation which grew up under that influence, began as a poet (1830 and 1831) and a novelist (*O T*, 1836), before making his great success with the immortal series of children's stories. All his writing has charm, and this was early shown in *The Improvisatore* (1834) and other travel-sketches, while his play *The Mulatto* (1840) found fervent admirers. His specialty, however, was disclosed first by *Agnes and the Merman* (1834), and needs no emphasising here A country which contributed Thorwaldsen, Oehlenschlager and Andersen to the common stock must be credited with no small influence on the imaginative literature of Europe.

The severance of Norway[1] from Denmark in 1814, closely following the establishment of Christiania University in 1811, rendered possible the creation of a national literature in the more northern country. This creation absorbed her energies during the period we have in review. At first the results were but slender: it is not till writers born under the new régime had grown to maturity that we find anything requiring separate attention. Henrik Arnold Wergeland (1808-45) is considered the father of modern Norwegian poetry, and much of his short life was taken up by his dispute with Johann Sebastian Welhaven (1807-73), an upholder of Danish culture. The controversy between these two finally determined the course of Norwegian literature, paving the way for the future triumphs of Bjornson, Ibsen, and Jonas Lie. Within the limits of our survey, however, little more than the foundation was laid. Wergeland's facile verse was mainly a pioneer, and owed its acceptance to date and local conditions as well as its own freshness and fluency. Welhaven was more satirist than poet, Andreas Munch (1811-84) a versifier of talent rather than genius. More interesting work was done in prose by Peter Christian Asbjornsen (1812-85), a naturalist of repute, and Jorgen Moe (1815-82), also known as a poet, who worked together on a

Norway

[1] Botten-Hansen, *Norvege littéraire* (Christiania, 1868), Halfdansen, *Norsk Forfatter-lexicon* (ibid., 1881 seq.), *Studies in Northern Literature*, by Edmund William Gosse (London, 1879), *Sweden and Norway*, by F. H. Woods (London, 1882), *Norway and the Norwegians*, by C. F. Keary (London, 1892).

collection of national folk-tales, continued in later publication by Asbjornsen alone. These are the tales made known to English readers by Sir George Dasent's translations (*Popular Tales from the Norse*, &c.) And work of greater importance was also done in various fields of scientific research, of which it must suffice to instance the historico-antiquarian studies of Jacob Rudolf Keyser (1803-64), lector in the University of Christiania, and of Peder Andreas Munch (1810-63), a cousin of the above-named poet

Sweden Ling and Tegner

Sweden,[1] before her union with Norway in 1818, had felt a similar wave of revival To the French Classicism of the previous Century succeeded two schools, the Phosphorists and the Gothics. The former, so called from their organ *Fosforos* (about 1813), were largely influenced by German Romanticism; the latter were more directly national, and studied simplicity as well as warmth and freedom Both together correspond to the school of Oehlenschlager in Denmark, and to the *Sytten-de mai* or *Declaration of Independence* school in Norway. The leader of the first band was Pehr [Peter] Daniel Amadeus Atterbom (1790-1855), eminent as a poet, and also as author of a review of Swedish literature, *Svenska Siare och Skalder*. With him went Lorenzo Hammarskold (1785-1827), Vilhelm Fredrik Palmblad (1788-1852), Karl Fredrik Dahlgren (1791-1844), and the poetess Julia Nyberg (1785-1854), who in various

[1] Sturzenbecher, *Die neuere schwedische Litteratur* (Leipzic, 1850), Meijer, *Svensk literatur-lexicon* (Stockholm, 1886)

fields carried on war against academic convention, and introduced richer colouring and bolder ideals. The second or *Gothic* branch had leaders yet more distinguished in the persons of Ling, Tegnér, and Geijer Pehr Henrik Ling (1776-1839), while author of vigorous poems such as *Gylfe* (1812), *Asarne* (1816), &c., is still better known as the perfecter of a rational system of health-gymnastics, to which he attached intellectual as well as physical import. Esaias Tegnér (1782-1846), whose first poem *Svea* (1811) was written under the influence of the so-called *Iduna Society* or Gothic league, developed into the greatest poet of modern Sweden His genius was mainly lyrical, yet his well-known *Frithiof's Saga* (several times translated into English) tells the old romantic tale with vigour and swing. Another poem, *Nattvards Barnen*, is known in Longfellow's translation as "The Children of the Lord's Supper"

If Tegnér was the chief poet, Erik Gustav Geijer (1783-1847), Professor at Upsala, was hardly less prominent as a prose writer But as his chief writings were historical and philosophical, we need stay to note only the *Svenska Folkvisor* (1814-16) which he edited along with his friend Afzelius More germane to our subject are the imaginative works of Karl Jonas Ludwig Almqvist (1793-1866), a voluminous author in many departments of prose, from fiction to mathematics. Standing somewhat aloof from both schools, he leaned rather to the *Fosforisterna*, but refused obedience to their codes as to most social regulations. His changeful life, which

Almqvist

included an accusation of murder, an escape to the United States, and a final return to Norway under an assumed name, seems reflected in his works, particularly his novels both are represented in the edition of his *Life and Works* (6 vols, Stockholm, 1874-78)

Runeberg and others

All these writers were born in the Eighteenth Century, and many yet remain to notice. The humorous novels of Fredrik Cederborgh (1784-1835), the historical romances of Gustav Wilhelm Gumaelius (1789-1877), the brilliant poems of Erik Johan Stagnelius (1793-1823), who has been compared to Shelley, and the one lyrical volume of Erik Sjoberg (1794-1828), published under the name of "Vitalis," well deserve note here And it would be unpardonable not at least to mention the names of Johan Jakob, Baron Berzélius (1779-1848), Sweden's great chemist, and Christopher Jacob Boström (1797-1866), her most original philosophical thinker. Enough has been said to show how powerful was the Swedish literary movement during the earlier years of our period During the later, it continued to put forth names of European celebrity Fredrika Bremer (1801-65) is well known as a novelist in this country, chiefly through the translations of (Mrs) Mary Howitt Her earlier books, at any rate, beginning with *The H Family* (1830), her first undoubted success, show the Romantic spirit in full power, quickened later by cosmopolitan travels and sympathies. Something like a dozen volumes of *Sketches* (*Teckningar*) contain her collected stories, of which *The Neighbours* and *Scenes in Dalecarlia* may

be selected as representative Less known abroad, but highly esteemed at home, Johan Ludwig Runeberg (1804-77) carried on the poetical succession with undiminished power. Several of his poems have appeared in English dress (*e.g.*, Magnusson and Palmer's *Runeberg's Lyrical Songs*, 1878) The earliest of these appeared in 1830, while the *Elk Hunters* (1832) and the hexametrical *Hanna* (1836) secured among other poems his fame Later, he turned to drama, and contributed largely to the Psalm-book of his Church These were the most illustrious of the younger school.

Runeberg was by birth a Finn, which may remind us of the attention given to folk-songs and ancient poetry in that region, particularly by Elias Lonnrot (1802-84) In 1835 he published the first edition of his *Kalevala* (nearly doubled in the second edition, 1847, best edition, Helsingfors, 1862). Whatever scholars may say as to the fidelity of this version of the ancient epic, Lonnrot's edition made it celebrated through Europe, and probably suggested to Longfellow the metre of *Hiawatha* His *Kantele* (1829-31) and *Kanteletar* (1840)—the name being taken in each case from the zither-like instrument which accompanies the recitation—did the same service for Finnish folk-songs, a service parallel to what was being done for other literatures elsewhere. A life of studious labour was crowned at the end by the production of his great Finnish Dictionary.

Finland

From Finland the transition is easy to her great

neighbour, Russia[1] Among the Scandinavian nations —still at the close of our period separate entities in literature if not in politics, and only some twenty years later making essays at linguistic uniformity — we have seen a movement conditioned indeed by foreign influence, yet rooted in native strength, and corresponding to a free development of social and political life The Norse nations borrowed, but were not enslaved; they gave and took in almost equal proportion. Particularly, the wave of Byronism, which we have seen overspreading Southern Europe with its flood, had little effect comparatively on them, they could be Romantic without being pessimistic It is otherwise with that distant and strange literature, guessed at through the dim medium of translation, which unites something fierce and barbaric to familiar cadences So far as can be thus judged, Russian literature during our epoch seems mainly a copy of Western models, distorted in places by gigantic and outlandish shadows Without Byron there could hardly have been Pushkin or Lermontov, their indisputable genius would at least have taken other shape. Possibly the Byronic influence came through France, through Musset and Gautier and Heine, French literature having been usually more important to Russia than that of her nearer neighbour

Russian literature

[1] Courriere, *Histoire de la littérature contemporaine en Russie* (Paris, 1874), Haller, *Geschichte der russischen Litteratur* (Riga, 1882); Reinholdt, *ditto* (Leipzic, 1885), *Russia*, by W R Morfill (London, 1880), *Studies in Russian Literature*, by C E Turner (London, 1882); *Rhymes from the Russian*, by Dr John Pollen (London, 1891)

Germany. Yet Russians are proverbially great linguists, and Pushkin knew our language from childhood. What seems certain, at any rate, is that French, English, and German masters all found apt pupils east of mid-Europe, though the seed sowed fell into a soil of abnormal fruitfulness

These remarks apply especially to the later writers of our period At its beginning, Ivan Andreevich Kriloff (1768-1844) was just putting forth his *Fables* (translated by W R Ralston, 1868), and Nicolas Michailovich Karámsin (1765-1826) had still to commence publishing his great *History of Russia* Nevertheless one regards these as writers of the previous generation On the other hand, Konstantin Batioushkov (1787-1855), who was long insane, is known to have studied not only Byron but Mill, Macaulay, and Buckle, the last a favourite author in Russia It were idle to pause over names which are no more than names to us, over the poems and translations of Zhukovski, Koltzov, or Nekrasov, the historical writings of Oustrialov and Solóviev Attention will be more profitably concentrated on the two or three names familiar to Western Europe, which sufficiently exemplify the tenor of our description.

Kriloff and others

Alexander Sergéjevich Pushkin (1799-1837) has been styled the Russian Heine Of good family, like most Russian authors—since between noble and peasant there was hardly any intervening middle class — he entered the Government service, but was soon dismissed for Liberalism As

Pushkin

poet he began with *Ruslan and Ludmila* (1820) and *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* (1822), which are wholly romantic; while in *Tzigani* (1827) and *Eugene Onegum* (1828) he had fully developed his style, the latter being a narrative poem akin to *Beppo* and *Don Juan* Till now, says Tolstoi, Pushkin was himself,—a self, we may add, built up of many foreign elements. Nor does *Poltava* (1829), a tale with Mazeppa as its hero, show much emancipation from Byronic influence But about this time he was deep in study of Shakespeare, and his famous tragedy *Boris Godunov* (1831) was the result. This most critics regard as his masterpiece, while to Tolstoi[1] it is a "cold, brain-spun work," coming from theory instead of the heart. For the remainder of his short life, terminated during a duel six years later, he continued to pour out work with unexhausted fluency, in prose as well as verse, and received the appointment of Russian historiographer. His books became widely known, and many have been translated into English, including *Eugene Onegum* (by Spalding, 1881) and a recent volume by C. E Turner, lector at St Petersburg, 1899 Taken as a whole, Pushkin is the most eminent writer of his time and country, and favours English directness rather than German ideality. With some of Byron's vigour, he has little of his copious imagery, little also of his rhetorical mouthing. Grace seems more evident than strength, and his cosmopolitan learning may have interfered with native and natural growth These suggestions of criticism, however, must be

[1] *What is Art?* (authorised English translation, 1898), p 121

taken with all the reserve imposed by complete ignorance of the originals.

Gogol

Nicolai Vasilievich Gogol (1809-52), ten years junior to Pushkin, excelled in prose comedy and fiction more racy of the soil than the latter's poems. His play, *The Inspector-General* (1836; English translation, 1892) satirises provincial officialdom, while his novel, *Dead Souls* (1837; English translation,[1] 1887), deals with the petty life of a provincial town. Thus Gogol—who spent his early years in St Petersburg, but lived abroad from 1836 to 1846, and ended his days at Moscow—was distinctly a predecessor of Tourguénev, whose *Sportsman's Sketches* appeared in 1846, though his full career falls outside our limits. Gogol receives praise from all quarters, including the critical Tolstoi, and while reflecting Romantic stir and freshness in his habit of thought seems to have combined with these a photographic fidelity to fact which goes far to anticipate the later Realistic development. He is the Dickens of Russia, but a Dickens of a different cast, with more pronounced leanings to Romanticism His influence on writers who followed was potent in the direction of Naturalism.

But one other name need be mentioned in Russia proper, that of Michail Jurevich Lermontov (1814-41)—the name denotes his descent from the Scottish family Learmont—who like Pushkin met his fate in a duel, but at the still earlier age of twenty-seven.

[1] An adaptation of this book had previously appeared (1854) under the title of *Home Life in Russia*

Serving in the Russian army, he did duty in the Caucasus, whose wild scenery inspired his earlier poems, while *Na Smert Poeta* (*The Poet's Death*, 1837) and the novel known in English as *A Hero of our Time* (1839, English translation, 1854) are considered his masterpieces. The latter is said to have provoked the duel which caused his death Lermontov was an assiduous student of our literature, and his verse and prose alike reflect Byronic models pretty closely He is essentially Romantic, and with Pushkin, and perhaps Zhukovski, stands for the highest achievement of his country in this direction After his death, the example set by Gogol gradually led Russian literature into other paths

In Russian Poland—unless we include the songs of Julian Ursyun Niemcewicz (1758-1841), soldier and statesman, who fought under Kosciuszko—the principal name of note is that of Adam Mickiewicz (1798-1855). He has been compared by some experts to Pushkin, and seems generally placed second to him only among Slav poets. As none of his works have been translated (though a *Life* in French by his son is said to have appeared), it must suffice to record that his earliest publications (1822) were *Grazyna* and *Dziady*, verse-tales full of local colour, that *Pan Tadeusz* (1832), an epic poem whose scene is laid in Lithuania, is considered his masterpiece; that besides other epics he wrote a vast number of lyrics; that he spent most of his life in banishment, frequently at Paris, and organised a Polish legion for service against Russia, and that in 1890 his bones

Mickiewicz

were brought home, and buried beside those of Kosciuszko in Cracow Cathedral. Casimir Brodzinski, Julius Slowacki, and Sigismund Krasinski rank next in poetical distinction, Slowacki carrying on the Byronic tradition unimpaired. Of the "Ukraine poets," Anton Malczewski (1793-1826) met Byron at Venice, achieved notoriety by ascending Mont Blanc, and is remembered mainly by his poem *Marya* (1825), a Corsair story quite in the orthodox Romantic vein.

Hungarian literature

Though the Magyar tongue[1] is of immense antiquity, its literature is still youthful. The years we have in review saw it established as a vehicle of thought as well as action, and wielded by some notable writers. Political changes, the growth of national feeling, the rise of a middle class, the development of urban life, combined to create a school of thought which found culminating expression in the Diet of 1825, and the subsequent foundation of a Hungarian Academy (1830). This school had owed much to the labours of Ferenc [Francis] Kazinczy (1759-1831), and later to the munificence and enthusiasm of Count Stephen Széchényi (1792-1860). Its results assumed literary form in the writings of Hungary's Romantic authors.

Of these the brothers Kisfaludy come first in order.

[1] *Hungarian Literature*, by Emil Reich (London, 1898); *Geschichte der ungarischen Litteratur*, by J. H. Schwicker (Leipsic, 1889). Bodnár, Szana, Beothy, and Sannyei have written Magyar histories of Hungarian literature.

Sandor [Alexander] Kisfaludy (1772-1844) had just before our period opens led the way with *Himfy's Love-songs* (*Himfy szerelmei*, 1801, second part, 1807) The success of these led him to pour forth novels, plays, and poems, of which only his ballads retain any popularity. His much younger brother Karoly [Charles] (1788-1830), after a youth of poverty and privation, captured his public with a play, *The Tartars* (1819), and for nine years (1822-30) directed and inspired the literature of his day as editor of the poetic annual *Aurora*[1] His poems and plays, thrown off often at a heat, couple humorous presentment with Romantic tone; his prose tales give vivid pictures of contemporary life Michael Vorosmarty (1800-55), a more accomplished artist, took occasion by the hand when in the very year of Hungary's awaking he published his epic poem *Zalan's Flight* (*Zalán futása*, 1825) This patriotic masterpiece was followed by other epics, as well as lyrics and dramas, all marked by the same sustained elevation of style. After a considerable interval, Janos [John] Arany (1817-82) and Michael Tompa (1819-68) carried on the poetic succession, the former especially combining culture with inspiration, and besides his creative work (begun by *Toldi*, 1847, and *Murány*, 1849), doing excellent service by translating plays of Shakespeare and others. But the youngest member of this group is also the best known abroad Sandor Petofi (1823-49) has been compared to Burns

Romantic poets

[1] The "Kisfaludy Society," founded in 1836, preserves his memory by encouraging Magyar literature in all forms

and Béranger, but with little justice His poems, which have been translated into English and into French as well as German, seem more akin to Heine than to either. This Hungarian youth, who lived but one year longer than Keats, during the seven years of his poetical career excelled chiefly in short pieces, modelled on his native folk-songs, but breathing into these new grace, humour, tenderness, and subtlety Some tales and plays have little value But his lyrics, from *The Wine-drinker* (*A borozó*, 1842) to his latest war-songs, of which *Up, Hungarian!* (*Talpra, Magyar!* 1848) was first and most famous, reveal a true singer, with a cadence of his own Hungarian scenery, its mountains and its vast *steppes*, live again on his pages, and are peopled by lifelike figures In Petofi his country has made her most striking contribution to the treasures of European poetry Throwing himself ardently into the fight for freedom against Austria, he laid down his life on the battle-field of Segesvár

In prose fiction three writers of noble birth stand out prominent. Nikolaus, Baron Jósika (1794-1865), led the way with *Tendency* (*Irány*, 1834) and *Abafi* (1836), the latter a historical novel named from its hero He followed up these by a long string of historical romances, in which patriotic motive somewhat overpowers artistic creation. Jozsef [Joseph], Baron Eotvós (1813-71), bid earlier for fame, and reached higher levels. His first novel, *The Carthusian* (1839), presented a psychological study of remarkable power and sadness, while *The Village Notary* (1845, English translation,

Romantic prose-writers

1850) was at once a striking picture of Hungarian life and a novel of political purpose After 1850 he turned mainly to didactic writing, and filled a conspicuous place as President of the Academy. Sigismund, Baron Kemény (1816-75), a fecund journalist, covered a wider field than Eotvos, and his *Gyulai Pál* (5 vols., 1844-46) is said to be worthy of Balzac. He confined himself, however, to historical novels—as the title just quoted exemplifies—and only in short stories essayed to depict the life of his day These three writers may be considered avant-couriers of Maurus Jokai (born 1825), whose inclusion would transgress our limits. In more serious studies Hungary produced many capable writers, though none who (as Liszt in music) conquered the European world Jozsef Bajza (1804-58) as critic, Ferenc Toldy (1805-75) as literary historian, and Michael Horváth (1809-78) as author of the chief History of Hungary, are perhaps best known. Louis Kossúth (1802-94) and Francis Deák (1803-76)—to use the most familiar form of their names—were both powerful writers, though their fame rests on other titles

Bohemian literature

During the first half of the nineteenth century the Czech[1] language underwent a still more striking resurrection. So universally had it been superseded by German, that even Josef Dobrovský (1753-1829), the chief pioneer in its study,

[1] *History of Bohemian Literature*, by Francis Count Lutzow (London, 1899) *Chekian Anthology*, by (Sir) John Bowring (London, 1832) Tieftrunk, *Historie Literatury Česke* (Prague, 1880)

despaired of its survival, and wrote his own works in German or Latin. But the school of Antonin Puchmayer (1769-1820) strove successfully against voluntary euthanasia. By the beginning of our period, national and patriotic feeling had begun to prevail, and about 1818 the establishment of a chair of Bohemian language in the University of Prague, and of a Society for studying Bohemian antiquities, recorded its triumph. This Society, known as the *Museum*, published its Journal in both languages, though Dobrovský urged that it should appear in German only The next generation, between 1820 and 1850, saw Czech become once more a living literary language, and sharing with its sister-tongues the Romantic influence

Its great revival

This patriotic revival was carried further by numerous writers. The earliest of importance was Josef Jakob Jungmann (1773-1847), whose main work was philological, and whose *Historie Literatury České* (1825, enlarged edition, 1849), as also his Bohemian-German Lexicon (1835-39), form the foundation on which later workers have built. Jungmann was a student and translator of foreign literature, and published renderings from Milton and Gray, Goethe and Schiller, Chateaubriand and others His version of *Paradise Lost*, in the national trochaic measure (that of Browning's *One word more*), appeared as early as 1811, and is highly praised by competent critics These and other pieces were collected into a volume in 1841. Jungmann had great influence on the younger writers who follow. Wenceslaus

Hanka (1791-1861), indeed, was more directly a pupil of Dobrovský, and completed some of his philological work. Librarian of the national Museum, he distinguished himself by discovering certain invaluable historical manuscripts. His own poems are not striking, but his collection of old Bohemian poetry (5 vols, 1817-25) had wide circulation The three chief writers of this younger generation, however, were friends and pupils of Jungmann Jan [John] Kollar (1793-1854), on the whole the leading poet of his day, clergyman and scholar, wrote in German as well as Bohemian He, too, published a collection of national songs (1823 and 1827, enlarged edition, 1834-35), also sermons (*Kazne*, 1831) and notes of travel (*Cestopis*, 1843) But his fame rests on his great poem *The Daughter of Slava* (*Slávy Dcera*, 1821, enlarged, 1824). This extraordinary book of sonnets records his love for an earthly maiden, but passes on to glorify her as a goddess, and through her lips address fervent exhortations to the Slav races generally. Its form seems reminiscent at once of Dante and Byron, the author being personified as a "pilgrim" somewhat resembling Childe Harold Alike poetically and politically, *Slava's Daughter* had immense effect, and was the most prominent imaginative work of Czech Romanticism.

The other members of this trio wrote mainly in prose. Pavel [Paul] Josef Šafařík (1795-1861) edited a book of songs, and executed verse translations from Aristophanes and Schiller (1816) But his main work was philological, and

End of first stage

found expression in a History of Slavonic Language and Literature (1826; best edition, 1869), and a great book on Slavonic Antiquities (1837, enlarged, 1863). His intimate friend, Franz Ladislav Palacký (1798-1876), first editor of the aforesaid Journal, studied English literature attentively, and began his career by translating "Ossian" and publishing essays on æsthetical philosophy (1821 and 1823), which show fruit of this study. Ten years later he wrote a life of his master, Dobrovský (1833). The best years of his life were given to his *History of Bohemia* (1836-67), of which the earlier volumes were originally written in German, though later recast in Czech. This masterly work is perhaps the chief fruit of the Bohemian revival, and the best known outside its author's country. Kollar, Šafařík, and Palacký at any rate represent all that was best in the movement they led, and perhaps the only other name requiring mention is that of Franz Ladislav Celakovský (1799-1852), who, besides translating Scott's *Lady of the Lake* and editing collections of folk-songs (1822 to 1829), published also some "Echoes" of national poetry (Russian, Lithuanian, Bohemian) which are said to be much more than echoes, one of his best volumes being fancifully named *Centifolium* (1840). With these writers the first stage of the Bohemian revival was completed; its later fortunes pass beyond our limit.

CONCLUSION.

GENERAL SUMMARY—FEATURES OF MOVEMENT—FORMS OF EXPRESSION —NEW USE OF PROSE—DIRECTION OF WORKING—FINAL EFFECT

General summary

But few remarks of a more general kind need be added to those advanced in previous pages. Throughout Europe as a whole, toward the end of the Eighteenth Century, a wave had gathered and swelled, whose full tide of triumph it has been our task to trace, whose later ebb we are not called to follow The year 1850 may, for practical purposes, be taken as its turning-point Dates can be but approximate, different countries felt the impulse in differing degrees. But it remains broadly true that about that time European letters seemed to enter a new phase. The Romantic reaction had done its work, varied according to varying needs and capabilities; new motives and methods began to assert themselves If in one sense Realism seem the ebb-tide of Romanticism, we must still remember that metaphors mislead, and that every inspiration is flood-tide to its votaries. To dilate on this would take us past our province But, without overstep-

ping prescribed boundaries, it is easy to recognise a turn of movement, something of pause and new departure, in European literature at or about last mid-Century.

Features of Movement

The Teutonic nations had felt the wave first. Whatever its origin, it acquired potency earliest among them, and from them spread later through the Latin and Slavonic races In so spreading, it lost some characteristics, took on others. But it remains recognisable, alike in its ideals and in its methods The same new-born love of antiquity, coupled with fervid zeal in attacking present problems, the same impatience of all that was formal, and measured, and restrained, the same awakening of a sense of largeness, remoteness, and mystery, as the intellectual horizon widened around; a passionate sympathy with Nature, and an eager grasping after some life higher than hers, these inspired all forms of the movement Even where it failed to attract, it acted with scarcely less strength by repulsion. For good or evil, the old order was shattered The trimness, the self-complacency, the circumscribed and restricted outlook, which conditioned even the best Eighteenth-Century writing, were thrown to the winds. Whatever came in their place—whether hope, enthusiasm, belief in some bright realisable future, or scepticism and despairful pessimism—it came not from coldness, but from excess of consuming heat. Indifference, even in the hour of reaction from ideals tried and found wanting, had no place in Romanticism

Change of faiths and ideals was accompanied by

change of method. Forms consecrated by the prescription of centuries were ruthlessly cast aside The new spirit either invented new forms, or revived old ones novel from long disuse. Artificiality had so mastered the shrunken technique of Classicism, that freedom and natural growth seemed incompatible with its limitations. A perilous loosening of all ties and conventions marked the revolution-era of the Romantics. Just as, in matter, they were careless of probability and delighted in tales of monsters and hobgoblins, as, indeed, in ethical conduct they sought to be each a law to himself, so too in style and execution they rejoiced in trampling over accepted rule Independence, originality, brilliance and effectiveness at whatever cost, were the things really sought and prized. So long as words glowed, and thought struck fire from thought, the means used mattered little, nay, illegitimate means had the charm of the forbidden, the merit of defying tyranny and convention

Forms of expression

If this was true of poetry, it was still more true of prose The use of prose for most purposes of poetry was itself a form of revolt Some precedents there had been in the previous generation. But to our period belongs the perfecting of prose for highest flights of imaginative achievement. The prose of Ruskin and Carlyle, of Victor Hugo, of Heine and Leopardi, came as revelation and revolution. Here were the figures, the cadences, the boldness of conception and charm of composition, usually esteemed the privilege of verse alone The

New use of prose

widespread cultivation of prose, not for didactic or expository work merely, but for all provinces and all possibilities of thought, has been seen a striking feature of the time we had in review, and must be noted here as a manifestation of the ruling spirit that impelled our Movement.

Direction of working

The Romantic reaction was not identified with any special form of belief. Its triumph did not secure the predominance of any religious or political creed. It was rather a tone of mind, which led different thinkers to different conclusions The impulse was identical, the results as various as the persons it affected. Catholic or free-thinker, Radical or Conservative, a writer could still be essentially Romantic Other causes were at work, conditioning development The tyranny of Napoleon called out national feeling, and we have seen how this reacted on literature The transcendental philosophy of Germany taught new views of life The nature-worship of Rousseau, the sentimental Toryism of Scott, the affected cynicism of Byron, the sympathetic glow and enthusiasm for humanity of Shelley and Hugo, are at once typical instances of the variety possible to Romanticism, and creative influences making that variety greater. If, in the end, the rods of Byron and Heine swallowed up those of the other magicians, this was because the movement then tended to decadence, in its heyday of triumph, it had room for all varieties that the most diverse intellects could conceive

Every movement has its vulnerable side. This that

we have examined was no exception. It is hard for us, born under later ideas, to judge rightly the qualities which gave it strength We are amused by its naiveté, impatient of its seriousness, vexed by coarseness in its satire and artificiality in its pathos. Much of this is merely want of historical sympathy, the inability of one generation to understand another. We are too near to be impartial judges, not near enough to sympathise perfectly. But no one can deny the magnitude of effect and result produced European literature was remoulded in the process. The ideas, and dogmas, and methods of Eighteenth-Century Classicism seem remote indeed now. These Romantics, on the other hand, are our elder brethren. We may be sarcastic, or indignant, or apathetic toward them, but it is as toward members of our own family They made modern literature what it is. They started, at all events, forces which have shaped our literature, though it was not theirs to foresee the direction in which these forces would work. For this reason alone their achievement deserves homage. When, beyond this, we realise the greatness, the absolute bulk and stature, of the men themselves, respect deepens into wonder. There were giants in those days, and they did gigantically their work. Their second rank contained many men who would have been leaders in most eras. That even the greatest were mortal, and mixed mortal elements in their divine creation, needs no prophet to tell us. Hay and stubble must perish, however magnificent the building But the imperishable part of these

Final effect.

men's work far outweighs the transitory. Their best lesson is deathless It cannot be summed up in a sentence, or designated by a word Students of this volume will probably have formed their own idea of its prevailing purport One important element, and most characteristic, was its *humanity*. More than aught else, perhaps, the Romantic Movement stood for humanity in the widest sense, made man as man the theme of central interest Our antiquarian zeal, our philosophy and economy, our social experiments, even our religious conceptions, all date back to this It is the dominating feature of modern thought and inquiry. And it is this idea above all others, clothed in various forms, expressed in utterances often the most antagonistic and inconsistent, which we have seen animating all classes of European literature during the period of Romantic Triumph.

INDEX.

A'Beckett, 129
Abercrombie, 171
About, 254
Ainsworth, 106
Airy, 151
Aleardi, 359
Alford, 188
Alison, 4, 136, 141.
Almqvist, 380
Ampère, 261
Ancelot, 257.
Andersen, 377
Appenzeller, 371
Arago, 214
Arany, 389
Arndt, 297
Arnim, L von, 293, 302.
Arnold, Thomas, 136-138, 181
Asbjornsen, 378
Atterbom, 379
Auerbach, 337, 338.
Auersperg, 336
Augier, 258, 260
Austen, Jane, 82-85, 122
Austin, John, 156, 158, 163, 164, 311.
Aytoun, 129
Azeglio, 351, 352, 361.

Baggesen, 376
Bailey, 101.
Baillie, Joanna, 4, 34, 102.
Bain, 162
Bajza, 391
Balbo, 361
Balmes, 369, 370
Balzac, 236-242, 245, 247, 248, 260, 274, 278, 391.
Banim, 88
Barante, 199, 209
Barbauld, Mrs, 34
Barham, 99
Barrow, 100
Batioushkov, 384
Baur, 322, 340
Baynes, 175
Bechstein, 336.
Beddoes, 56, 57 note.
Beer, 335.
Beets, 373.
Bekker, 307.
Bell, 352 note
Belzoni, 100.
Bentham, 4, 156-158, 160
Béranger, 197, 390
Berchet, 351
Bernard, Charles de, 252.
Berzelius, 381.
Beyle ("Stendhal"), 235, 254, 261.
Bilderdijk, 372
"Blackwood," 89, 96-98, 174.
Blake, 34, 127
Blanc, 265.
Blessington, Lady, 88.
Bockh, 307
Bogaers, 372.
Bonald, 199, 213
Bonjour, 260
Bopp, 307
Borne, 306, 330, 331.

Borrow, 130
Bostrom, 381
Botta, 347, 361
Bowles, 4, 15, 31
Bowring, 100
Brandis, 307
Bremer, 381
Brennet, 130
Brentano, 293, 296, 297, 302, 312
Breton de los Herreros, 367
Brewster, 105, 110
Brink, Bakhuizen van den, 374
Brodzinski, 388
Brontes, the, 120-123
Brougham, 90
Brown, Robert, 146, 147
Brown, Thomas, 171, 172
Browne, E. H., 188
Browning, Mrs. 58-62, 83, 246, 363
Browning, Robert, 10, 58, 59, 65, 67-71, 102, 219, 300, 311, 363, 392
Brunton, Mrs., 86
Buchner, Georg, 337
Buchner, J. A., 320
Buckland, 147, 149, 150, 152
Buckstone, 103
Burns, 28, 29, 104, 198, 389
Burton, 144
Butler, Archer, 170
Byron, Lord, 2, 3, 11, 13, 17, 25, 33-45, 47, 49, 56, 58, 63, 81, 101, 219-221, 226, 227, 231, 233, 276, 299, 331, 334, 336, 348, 350, 355, 358, 362, 366, 368, 369, 373, 383-385, 388, 393, 398

Cabanyes, 367, 370
Calderon, Estebanez, 367, 369
Calderwood, 175
Campbell, 32, 89, 133
Cantu, 359, 361
Carducci, 357
Carleton, 84, 88
Carlyle, 3, 36, 91, 104-106, 112, 124, 126, 127, 136, 140, 141, 144, 145, 153, 166, 181, 184, 185, 212, 293, 314, 397.
Carrel, 203, 263
Carrer, 359
Cederborgh, 381
Celakovsky, 394.
Cesarotti, 347
Chalmers, George, 133
Chalmers, Thomas, 189
Chambers, Robert, 125, 150
Chambers, William, 125
Chamisso, 293
Champollion, 214
Chenier, 196.
Clarke, 100
Cobbett, 4, 91, 93-95
Coleridge, Sara, 57
Coleridge, S. T., 2, 4-8, 15, 16, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30 note, 56, 89, 94, 95, 101, 105, 128, 146, 156, 160, 166-171, 175, 180, 233, 314
Colletta, 347, 361.
Combe, 177
Comte, 155, 156, 162, 201, 211, 214, 262, 272-276, 278
Constant, 199, 201, 202, 371
"Cornwall, Barry," 56
Courier, 202, 203
Cousin, 204, 207, 360 note
Coyne, 103
Crabbe, 4, 34
Craik, G. L., 136, 140
Craik, Mrs., 120
Creuzer, 305
Croker, Crofton, 88
Croker, J. W., 99
Cunningham, 56
Cuvier, 214.

Dahlgren, 379
Dahlmann, 310
Dalton, 146, 147
Damiron, 209
Darley, 56, 57 note
Darwin, Charles, 152-155, 275
Davis, 130
Davy, 146, 147
Deak, 391
Delavigne, 196, 257, 258, 260
De Morgan, 151
De Quincey, 95, 105, 127, 166, 304, 314
Desbordes-Valmore, Madame, 270
Deschamps, Antony, 221
Deschamps, Emile, 221
Detmold, 340
Dickens, 3, 88, 112-116, 119, 120, 303, 334, 386
Disraeli, Benjamin, 116-119, 136, 278.

D'Israeli, Isaac, 1, 116
Dobell, 101
Dobrovsky, 391-391
Donoso, 369
D'Orsay, 99
Doucet, 260.
Dumas, Alex (*père*), 87, 222, 236, 237, 243 246, 254, 259, 260
Dumas, Alex (*fils*), 211, 251, 256, 260
Dunlop, 99
Dupont, 234
Duran, 369.

Edgeworth, Miss, 84, 88
Eichendorff, 299
Eichhorn, 320
Elphinstone, 130
Empis, 260
Enfantin, 213
Estves, 390, 391
Espronceda, 365, 367 370

Faber "Fernan Caballero," 367
Faraday, 147, 169
Farnell, 203, 261, 348, 370
Ferrier, Miss, 85 86
Ferrier, T F, 174
Feuchtersleben, 336
Feuerbach, Anselm von, 311
Feuerbach, Ludwig, 311
Finlay, 137, 140
Forbes, Edward, 151
Forbes, J D, 151
Forster, 144
Forsyth, 100.
Foscolo, 347, 349
Foster, 178
Fouqué, 181, 292, 296, 297, 302
Fournier, 213, 264
'Fraser,' 90, 105
Fraser, 175
Freeman, 144
Freiligrath, 336
Freytag, 337, 338
Frohlich, 371
Fromentin, 264
Froude, Anthony, 144, 186
Froude, R. H, 186

Gallega, 365
Galluppi, 359
Galt, 86.
Gans, 318, 331
Gaskell, Mrs, 120, 122
Gauss, 282, 320, 343
Gautier, 216 228-230, 232-234, 237, 250, 254, 260, 261, 383.
Gay, Madame, 269.
Geibel, 337
Geijer, 380
Gell, 140
Gennadios, 370
Gerok, 337
Gervinus, 339,
Gesenius, 307
Gifford, 34, 91
Gilles, 133
Gioberti, 360
Giordani, 351, 359.
Girardin, Émile de, 263
Girardin, Madame de, 270.
Girardin, Saint-Marc, 261, 263
Giraud, 351
Giusti, 358
Gleig, 88, 99
Godwin, Mary See Shelley, Mrs
Goethe, 35, 36, 40, 43, 101, 162, 193, 199, 205, 217, 277, 281-286, 288-291, 293, 294, 298, 299, 302 304, 306, 318, 321, 342, 349, 351, 392
Gogol, 386, 387
Goncourts, E and J, 251
Gore, Mrs, 88
Gorres, 306
Gotthelf, 371
Gottschall, 338
Grant, 120
Grillparzer, 299.
Grimm, J, 282, 305, 307, 312
Grimm, W, 282, 305, 307
Grossi, 351, 352
Grote, 136, 138 140, 278
Grote, Mrs, 138
"Grun, Anastasius." See Auersperg
Grundtvig, 377
Guerin, Eugenie de, 268
Guerin, Maurice de, 268
Guerrazzi, 358
Guiraud, 258
Guizot, 199, 204-207, 209.
Gumelius, 381.
Gutzkow, 335

Hagenbach, 371.

Hall, Basil, 101.
Hall, Mrs S C, 119.
Hall, Robert, 178
Hallam, 134, 135, 141.
"Halm, Friedrich," 336.
Hamilton, William, 96, 156, 160, 161, 171-175
Hammarskold, 379.
Hampden, 180
Hanka, 393
Hare, Augustus William, 180
Hare, Julius, 180, 308.
Harring, 301
Hasebroek, 374
Hauch, 377
Hauff, 336
Haxthausen, 307
Hazlitt, 94, 127
Hebbel, 337.
Heber, 56
Heeren, 308
Hegel, 155, 207, 282, 314-318, 320, 321, 342
Heine, Heinrich, 55, 282, 285, 290, 295, 301-303, 305, 306, 313, 315, 316, 318, 323-335, 338, 341, 343, 344, 354, 356, 368, 383, 384, 390, 397, 398
Helps, 130
Hemans, 56, 59, 108
Hermann, 307
Herschel, 118
Heyne, 307
Heyse, 337
Hobhouse, 100
Hoffmann, "Amadeus," 285, 291, 296-302, 331
Hoffmann, Heinrich 339
Hoffmann of Fallersleben, 301
Hogg, 28, 101
Hood, 56, 57, 76, 116, 128
Hook, Theodore 87, 102
Hook, W F, 181
Horne, 101
Horvath, 391
Howitt, Mary, 99
Howitt, William, 99, 381.
Hugo, Victor, 2, 87, 126, 201, 215-223, 225, 226, 228-231, 234, 236, 243, 254-257, 260, 261, 272, 273, 277, 278, 348, 362, 364, 366, 397, 398
Humboldt, F, 282, 319
Humboldt, W., 282, 305, 319, 350
Hunt, Leigh, 33, 53, 91

Immermann, 301.
Inchbald, Mrs, 34.
Ingemann, 377.
Irving, 99

James, 106
Jamm, 252, 261.
Jeffrey, 7, 8, 19, 90, 91, 289
Jerdan, 99
Jerrold, Douglas, 103, 128
Jesika, 390.
Joubert, 262
Jouffroy, 208
Jouy, 257
Jungmann, 392.

Kant, 253
Keats, 23, 25, 33, 52 58, 61, 63, 65, 66, 68, 228, 390
Keble, 56, 147, 179, 182
Keightley, 135
Kemble, J M, 143
Kemény, 391
Kerner, 294
Keyser, 379
Kinglake, 130
Kinkel, 337
Kisfaludy, Karoly, 388
Kisfaludy, Sandor, 388
Kitto, 186
Kleist, 293, 306
Knapp, 301
Knight, 125, 110, 186
Kock, 252
Kolb, 340.
Kollar, 393, 394
Koltzov, 384
Kopisch, 301.
Korner, 298
Kossúth, 363, 391.
Krasinski, 388

Lachmann, 307
Lacordaire, 266, 270
Laing, 130
Lamartine, 195-197, 227, 230-234, 236, 266, 277, 366
Lamb, 22, 28, 91, 94, 95, 101, 127, 374.

Lamennais, 200, 216, 218, 266 268, 272, 275, 278 306
Landor, 17, 29 31, 69
Lappenberg, 311
Ludner, 125, 139, 148, &c
Lara, 367 370
Laube, 335
Lavard, 130
Leake, 100, 140
Lebrun, 257
Ledegranck, 374
Lefevre 221
Lemercier, 260
Lemon, 129
Lenau, 336
Lennep 373
Leopardi 352 357, 359, 362, 363, 368, 397
Lermontov, 383, 386, 387
Lever, 84, 119
Lewes, 161
Lewis, G C , 113
Ling, 380
Lingard, 134
Lister, 367, 369
Littre, 261, 263
Lobeck, 307
Lockhart, 80, 90, 97, 98
Lonmot, 382
Lover 88
Loyson, Charles, 197
Lyell, 149
Lytton, first Lord, 106 110, 116, 119

Macaulay, 56, 90, 107 111 145, 278, 384
M'Cosh, 175
M Crie, 134
Mackintosh, 133, 157, 161, 171
Macnish, 98
Madvig, 376
Maginn, 98
Magnin, 203
Maine, 163
Maistre, J M de, 199 215
Maistre, Xavier de, 199 note
Malcolm, 100.
Malczewski, 388
Malthus, 4, 176
Manning, 184, 187.
Mansel, 156, 161, 170, 175
Manzoni, 87, 203, 348 352, 355, 356, 358, 362, 363
Marryat, 87, 88
Martineau, James, 170, 187
Martineau Miss, 99, 119
Mathews, 103
Maturin, 88, 102
Maurice, 170, 180, 187.
Mavres, 260
Mazzini, 362
Meissner, 337.
Menzel, 306
Merimee, 229, 250, 251, 254.
Merivale, 144.
Messchart, 372.
Michaud, 209
Michelet, 211, 271
Mickiewicz, 387
Mignet, 270
Mill, James, 134, 157 160, 164, 165
Mill, J. S , 156, 158 164, 173, 175, 263, 279, 381
Miller, Hugh, 150, 190
Milman, 56, 102, 136.
Mitford Miss, 99, 102.
Mitford, William, 133, 138, 139
Moe, 378.
Mohler, 341
Mohl, 87, 99
Molbek, 376
Molitor, 322
Moller, 376
Montalembert, 189, 266, 267, 270
Monte, 347
Moore, 31, 133
More, Hannah, 34, 178.
Morell, 170
Morgan, Lady, 86.
Morier, 87, 88
Morike, 336
Morton, J M., 103.
Morton, Thos., 102.
Mosen, 336.
Moser, 306
Motherwell, 56
Muller, A H , 306.
Muller, Johann, 342.
Muller, Julius, 322.
Muller, O , 307.
Muller, W , 300, 334.
Mullner, 300
Munch, A , 378.
Munch, P A , 379.
Murchison, 148, 159.
Muse, 136, 140

Murger, 234
Musset, 217, 222, 225-228, 230, 246, 254, 260, 354, 368, 383

Napier, 135
Neander, 310
Nekrasov, 384
Nerval, 234, 327
Newman, F W , 187.
Newman, J H , 147, 182, 183 187
Newton, John, 178
Niccolini, 351
Niebuhr, 139, 181, 282, 308 310, 320, 350, 353
Niemcewicz, 387
Nisard, 262
Nodier, 221-223
"North, Christopher" See Wilson
Nota, 347, 351.
Nyberg, 379

Oehlenschlager, 375, 376, 377, 379
Oersted, A S , 376
Oersted, H C , 376
Oken, 282, 320
Oustaloff, 384
Owen, Richard, 119
Owen, Robert, 176
Ozanam, 269
Ozmans, 258.

Palacky, 394
Palgrave, 135
Palmblad, 379
Peacock, 56, 87, 88
Pellico, 351
Peloh, 389
Picard, 259
Pindemonte, 347
Pinkerton, 133
Platen, 300
Ponsard 255
Poole 102
Porter, Anna Maria, 85
Porter, Jane, 85
Porter, Robert, 100
Potgieter, 374
Praed, 56, 57, 76
Prater, 359
Proudhon, 264, 265
"Prout, Father," 129.
Puchmayer, 392
'Punch,' 128
Pusey, 181, 183
Pushkin, 383-387.

Quinet, 270, 271.

Ranke, 310, 340.
Rask, 376.
Remick, 336.
Remusat, 199, 209
Renan, 264, 341
Ricardo, 176, 177.
Richmond, 178
Richter, 282, 302-304, 332, 334, 338.
Rivas, 366
Rogers, Henry, 187
Rogers, Samuel, 4, 34
Romanos, Mesonero, 367
Rosa, 365
Roscoe, W , 133.
Rosini, 351
Rosmini-Serbati, 360, 362, 363
Rossetti, Gabriele, 351
Rovere, Mamiani della, 360 note
Ruckert, 297, 301
Ruge, 318.
Runeberg, 382
Ruskin, 127, 397

Šafařik, 393
Sainte-Beuve, 203, 222, 224, 233, 236, 252, 254, 257, 261, 268, 278, 351
Saint-Hilaire, Barthelemy, 262
Saint-Hilaire, Geoffroy, 214
Saint-Simon, 211, 213, 264, 272
Salamos, 370
"Sand, George," 236, 237, 246-251, 270, 278
Sandeau, 253
Savigny, Karl, 311, 318
Schelling, 167, 207, 282, 287, 305, 312-314, 316, 320, 341, 324
Schenkendorf, 297
Scherenberg, 301
Schmidlin, 336
Schimmel, 374.
Schlegel, A W., 282, 285, 286-290, 334, 350
Schlegel, F , 282, 285, 286-290, 321.
Schopenhauer, 282, 341
Schulze, 300
Schwab, 299
Schwegler, 340

Scott, Michael, 97, 98
Scott, Sir Walter, 2 I 6 15, 19 23, 25, 26, 29, 32, 38 40, 56, 58, 66, 75 82, 91 97 99, 99, 101, 104, 116 119, 133 138, 142, 143, 146, 210, 219 221, 233, 241 276, 303 304, 321, 331, 336, 349, 351, 366, 373, 394, 398
Scribe, 259, 260
Sedgwick, 147
Seidl, 336
Shack, 337
Sharpe, C K , 99
Shelley, 2 25, 30 note 35, 37 39 45 56, 58, 60, 63 68, 80, 101, 124, 265 355, 381, 398
Shelley Mrs, 15, 88
Shiel, 102
Simeon, 178
Simon, Jules, 263
Simrock, 339
Sismondi, 210, 371
Sjoberg, 381
Skene, 144
Slowacki, 388
Smith, Alexander, 101
Smith, Albert 129
Smith, Horace, 87
Smith, Sydney, 90 94
Sol ucy 384
Soulie, 231
Soumet, 257
Southey, 2, 16 18 26, 30, 89 92 93, 133, 135 146, 315
Soutzos, 370
Souvestre 253
Spitta, 336
Stagnelius, 381
Stanhope, 143
Staring, 372
Steffens, 305, 375
"Stendhal" See Beyle
Stephen, James, 136, 163
Stephen, J F , 163
Sterling, 181
Stewart, 4, 171, 172
Stifter, 336.
Strauss, 262, 270, 341
Strickland, Miss, 136, 140
Stubbs, 144.
Sue, 251.
Sybel, 340
Szechenyi, 389
Talfourd, 56, 102
Tamm, 371
Taylor, Isaac, 165
Taylor, Sir Henry, 56, 102.
Tegner, 376, 380
Tennyson, 3, 12, 58, 62 67, 169, 188, 337
Testi, 351, 361
Thackeray, 88, 109 112 113 116, 118 120, 122, 128, 198 252, 303, 333
Thierry, Amedee, 211
Thierry, Augustin, 210 212, 272.
Thiers, 206, 212, 270, 327
Thirlwall, 136, 139, 144, 181, 278, 309
Thorwaldsen, 377.
Tieck, 282, 285, 286, 288, 290 292, 302, 334
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 271.
Tolly, 391.
Tollens 372
Tommaseo, 359
Tompa, 389
Topffer, 371
Tricoupi, 371
Trollope Mrs, 119.
Trow, 361
Turner, Sharon, 134
Tytler, 136

Uhland, 282, 285, 295 297, 299, 333

Vacherot, 262.
Varese, 351
Varnhagen von Ense, 305, 329
Veitch, 175
Veuillot 263
Vigny, 221 222 224, 230, 254, 258.
Villemain, 204, 205, 207, 259
Vinet, 261, 371.
Vogl 336
Volksmuth, 389.
Voss, 282, 304

Wagner, Ernest, 304.
Wagner, Rudolph, 343.
Warburton, Eliot, 130.
Ward, W G , 188.
Warren, 99, 119.
Waterton, 100.
Weber, C H , 343.
Weber, F W , 337.
Weber, W E , 343

Welhaven, 378.
Wells, 56
Weigeland, 378
Werner, Gottlob, 305, 319
Werner, Zacharias, 289, 299.
Whately, 165
Whewell, 165
Wilberforce, Samuel, 186-188.
Wilberforce, William, 178, 186, 187
Wilson, 90, 97, 172
Wiseman, 185-187.
Wolf, 307, 308.
Wordsworth, 3, 4, 11, 15, 17-27, 44, 63, 66, 69, 78, 96, 101, 133, 194, 216, 218, 233, 285
Wyss, 371.

Zanella, 359.
Zedlitz, 299.
Zeller, 340
Zhukovski, 384, 387.
Zorrilla, 369
Zschokke, 304.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS.